

IOWA

George O. Smither, Anita.
 Leslie H. Hughes, Cedar Falls.
 Herman F. Volberding, Dike.
 Walter W. Jacobs, Guttenberg.
 J. B. Wood, Lenox.
 John W. Zike, Jr., Lewis.
 Wayne A. Staton, Marathon.
 John P. Delaney, Marcus.
 Frank G. Ferguson, Mechanicsville.
 Grace Ryan, Neola.
 Stacia E. Hartley, New Albin.
 William R. Schmitt, Nichols.
 Irene G. Gatton, Oakdale.
 Verne L. Heskett, Pulaski.
 Marcella E. Roeder, Rockwell.
 Lewis Magirl, Ryan.
 Dan Jerolaman, Shell Rock.
 George R. Shipley, Thurman.
 John J. Fink, Tripoli.
 Eugene T. Alcorn, West Union.

KANSAS

Harriet M. McCauley, Burlingame.
 Jack Comes, Burrton.
 Ellis C. Logsdon, Grenola.
 John T. Dowd, St. Paul.
 Daniel P. McCormick, Scammon.
 George W. Lank, Solomon.
 Kenneth L. Lavender, Valley Center.
 Ernest H. Hillman, Wakeeney.

MAINE

Ivadell Gaddis, East Machias.
 William S. Holmes, Northeast Harbor.

MARYLAND

W. George Miller, Accident.
 Earl T. Kelbaugh, Thurmont.

NEBRASKA

Edgar D. Collins, Ainsworth.
 Erwin E. Gardner, Curtis.
 Fred W. Schuman, Osceola.
 John F. Webster, St. Paul.
 Russell N. Linkswiler, Winnebago.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Carl E. Crowley, Ashland.
 Homer J. Forcier, East Jaffrey.
 Ernest E. Lefavour, Farmington.

OHIO

Stanley Lawrence Smith, Ashville.
 Fred J. Tank, Elmore.
 Frieda M. Lappen, Laurelvile.
 Frank A. Griebeling, Lexington.
 Fred E. Surgen, Murray City.
 Clyde L. Weiser, Orrville.
 Orion W. Kerschner, Trotwood.
 George W. Kinzey, Wayne.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jennie Moran, Braddock.

PUERTO RICO

Agustin Carbonell, Caguas.

RHODE ISLAND

Catherine Louise Davis, Portsmouth.

VIRGINIA

Martin Rosenbaum, Glade Spring.
 G. Frederick Switzer, Harrisonburg.
 William T. Roberts, Nassawadox.
 Levi E. Stephenson, Wakefield.

WASHINGTON

Frank Bryan Collins, Camas.
 William G. Meneice, Carson.
 Renee Houchen, Cathlamet.

Ralph Gildea, Garfield.
 Edna Smith, La Center.
 Quentin D. Mitchell, Long Beach.
 Milton E. Waste, Morton.
 Honora M. Connor, South Bend.

WISCONSIN

Walter F. Netzel, Crandon.
 Clara A. E. Manion, Oregon.
 Henry F. Schumacher, Stoughton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1936

The House met at 11:30 a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty One, Thou who art all in all, as we meet in prayer may we cherish these sacred moments. Here help us to realize the highest tones and capacities of our spiritual natures. Heavenly Father, let us pass into that communion that blossoms more and more unto the perfect spring. Speak the final word, blessed Lord, that both men and nations may learn that it is right and not might by which they are to live and endure. We praise Thee that Thy love is commensurate with Thy power, Thy promises are as immutable as Thy holiness, and that humanity's hopes are to be realized in the dateless Christ. Deliver us all from that selfishness which will not stop or be warned, that disregards human happiness, and for a trustless independence of our fellow men. In the name of the Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 6, 1936:

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Edgar H. Taber;
 H. R. 2936. An act for the relief of J. H. Taylor & Son;
 H. R. 4159. An act for the relief of Anchorage Commercial Co., Inc.;
 H. R. 4953. An act for the relief of Doris Lipscomb;
 H. R. 4999. An act for the relief of Marie Linsenmeyer;
 H. R. 5625. An act for the relief of Sperry Gyroscope Co., Inc., of New York;
 H. R. 5827. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Wyhowski, mother and guardian of Dorothy Wyhowski;
 H. R. 5874. An act for the relief of Hugh B. Curry;
 H. R. 5974. An act for the relief of Thelma L. Edmunds, Mrs. J. M. Padgett, Myrtis E. Posey, Mrs. J. D. Mathis, Sr., Fannie Harrison, Annie R. Colgan, and Grace Whitlock;
 H. R. 6520. An act for the relief of Preston Brooks Massey;
 H. R. 6599. An act for the relief of Florence Helen Klein, a minor;
 H. R. 6669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Earl Poynor;
 H. R. 6698. An act for the relief of Mae C. Tibbett, administratrix;
 H. R. 6821. An act for the relief of Alfred J. White, M. J. Banker, and Charlyn DeBlanc;
 H. R. 6828. An act for the relief of George H. Smith;
 H. R. 6999. An act for the relief of Frank Rottkamp;
 H. R. 7031. An act for the relief of Georgiana Minnigerode, widow of Capt. Karl Minnigerode;
 H. R. 7529. An act for the relief of Mariano Biondi;
 H. R. 7861. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. A. Joullian;
 H. R. 7867. An act for the relief of Adolph Micek, a minor;
 H. R. 7963. An act for the relief of J. Edwin Hemphill;
 H. R. 8113. An act for the relief of Louis George;
 H. R. 8301. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Marais des Cygnes River, in the State of Kansas, with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 8414. An act to provide a preliminary examination of the Yakima River and its tributaries and the Walla Walla River and its tributaries in the State of Washington, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 8486. An act for the relief of John A. Baker;

H. R. 8510. An act for the relief of John Hurston;

H. R. 8694. An act to provide a preliminary examination of Chickasawha River and its tributaries in the State of Mississippi, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 8706. An act for the relief of Frank Polansky;

H. R. 9190. An act for the relief of J. P. Moore;

H. R. 9235. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Cosatot River in Sevier County, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and leveeing the river and the cost of such improvements with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9236. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Red and Little Rivers, Ark., insofar as Red River affects Little River County, Ark., and insofar as Little River affects Little River and Sevier Counties, Ark., to determine the feasibility of leveeing Little River and the cost of such improvement, and also the estimated cost of repairing and strengthening the levee on Red River in Little River County, with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9244. An act providing for the establishment of a term of the district court of the United States for the northern district of Florida at Panama City, Fla.;

H. R. 9249. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and leveeing the river and the cost of such improvements with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9250. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Petit Jean River in Scott and Logan Counties, Ark., to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and leveeing the river and the cost of such improvements with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9267. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of Big Mulberry Creek, in Crawford County, Ark., from the point where it empties into the Arkansas River up a distance of 8 miles to determine the feasibility of cleaning out the channel and repairing the banks, and the cost of such improvement, with a view to the controlling of floods;

H. R. 9673. An act to authorize the recoinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held in San Diego, Calif., in 1936;

H. R. 9874. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of Cadron Creek, Ark., a tributary of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 10135. An act to authorize the construction of a model basin establishment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10487. An act to authorize a survey of Lowell Creek, Alaska, to determine what, if any, modification should be made in the existing project for the control of its floods;

H. R. 10583. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the San Diego River and its tributaries in the State of California with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 10985. An act to repeal Public Law No. 246 of the Seventy-second Congress;

H. R. 10991. An act for the relief of Harry Wallace;

H. R. 11042. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Matanuska River in the vicinity of Matanuska, Alaska;

H. R. 11486. An act for the relief of Mary Hemke;

H. R. 11573. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain purchasers of lands in the borough of Brooklawn, State of New Jersey", approved August 19, 1935;

H. R. 11793. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of various creeks in the State of California with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 11806. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of Passaic River, N. J., with a view to the control of its floods; and

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution to amend Public Act No. 435, Seventy-second Congress.

JOSEPH GURNEY CANNON

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House time has been set aside for paying tribute to a former Speaker of the House, Joseph Gurney Cannon.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we have set aside a brief few minutes today to pay tribute to one of the outstanding Speakers of this House, but the time is far too short in which to pay proper and deserving tribute to his memory—that of the Honorable Joseph G. Cannon, of the great State of Illinois, whom we honor on his one hundredth birthday anniversary.

He served in this House for 46 years—a longer period than any other man has ever served. It was my pleasure and privilege to have served with him for many years; and although I belonged to the opposite party and disagreed with him on many important policies, I nevertheless admired him for his ability, astuteness, courage, and fighting spirit.

I have served under seven Speakers—Cannon; Champ Clark, sometimes referred to as "the greatest Roman of them all"; the scholarly Gillette; the suave and affable Nicholas Longworth; the diamond-in-the-rough Garner; the genial and big-hearted Rainey; and the lovable and liberal Joseph Byrns.

They were all great men, but "Uncle Joe" Cannon, beyond any doubt, was one of the most outstanding and picturesque of them all. He was resourceful, able, and, as I said, fearless and courageous. Though a strong party man, he had as many warm friends on the Democratic side as on his own. In other words, in spite of all his faults, we loved him still.

While it is true many great men served in this body with and under Speaker Cannon, I must say in passing that we have just as fine and able a group of men here today. But as we all know, it is not the custom to pay tribute to the living but to reserve the flowers of praise and appreciation solely for the departed.

Cannon possessed great power, and knew how to use it, and did use it without stint. In fact, as Speaker he was the whole House, all by himself.

"Uncle Joe" ruled always with an iron hand. He determined what legislation should be passed and what defeated. He was able to do this through his power of appointment of committees. It was his custom not to appoint any Member to a committee until he ascertained from the Member himself how he stood on important legislation that would naturally have to be considered by such committee. If the Member could not satisfy "Uncle Joe" that he could be trusted implicitly to carry out his orders, he would not be appointed to that particular committee.

During his reign as Speaker, "Uncle Joe" was ably assisted by three powerful lieutenants, who, with himself, were known as the "big four", consisting of Sereno E. Payne, of New York; Sunny Jim Sherman, of New York, who became Vice President of the United States; John L. Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; and himself. The three held the big key positions, and were ever the trusted and loyal allies of the Speaker.

Although the Nation believed it was the "big four" who controlled the activities of this House in those days, I was always satisfied that it was the great Speaker, Joe Cannon, who himself and alone controlled the House, and controlled it even before he became the Speaker.

When he determined on a policy, the most influential and powerful opposition could not sway him, as the RECORD bears testimony. He was 86 years of age when he voluntarily retired from Congress.

Joseph Gurney Cannon was one of the most remarkable men of the ages. Even at the age of 86 his eyesight and hearing were remarkable, especially during the night sessions, as I can testify. I regret some of the other Members are not here who once joined in those famous night sessions, but, alas, most of them have gone with "Uncle Joe."

No one I have ever known has displayed the resourcefulness he showed during the turbulent and historical battle in 1910,

which carried on for 2 days and 2 nights, when he held the House against his opponents on this side, supported by some Republicans, endeavoring to take away certain powers of the Speaker and to liberalize the rules of the House.

Having had a small part in that contest, I hope that I will some day have an opportunity to review that memorable battle in my humble way, and to portray his wonderful parliamentary generalship, and how finally, as he was wont to say, "Any majority can do as it pleases", even to declaring the Speakership vacant.

Even when the motion was made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to declare the Speakership vacant, it did not faze him. He then stated: "You are now in the majority and you have the privilege to declare the chair vacant"—knowing full well they would not do so. He, indeed, was one of the most remarkable and outstanding legislators and statesmen I have ever read of, heard of, or had the privilege of serving with.

Joseph G. Cannon's life was a colorful one—from log cabin to high office and from poverty to wealth and affluence.

He was born 100 years ago today in the little town of Guilford, N. C. Four years later his parents journeyed in a covered wagon to the West and settled in the town of Bloomingdale, Ind., where Joseph grew to manhood. His early ambition was to be a lawyer, and this ambition was fulfilled upon his graduation from the Cincinnati Law School when he was admitted to the bar and commenced practice in the city of Terre Haute, Ind., in 1858. Foreseeing the advantages in the development of the State of Illinois and that better fortune and opportunity awaited him there, we find the young attorney established at Tuscola, Ill., in 1859, and within 2 years he became State's attorney for the twenty-seventh judicial district of Illinois, serving in that capacity until 1868.

Resuming private practice, he gained the confidence and good will of the people of his community; they recognized his ability and determination, and in 1873 he was elected to the Forty-third Congress, and was reelected eight successive terms. Defeated in the Fifty-second Congress, he was a candidate for election to the Fifty-third Congress, and again the people of his district honored him with the Congress seat. Then followed continuous service through the Sixty-second Congress. Defeated for reelection in the Sixty-third Congress, he stood for election to the Sixty-fourth Congress, and was successful.

His service in the House ended with his voluntary retirement at the end of the Sixty-seventh Congress—a total service of 46 years as a Member of Congress.

"Uncle Joe" was several times spoken for the Presidency. The farthest he ever got in that direction, however, was that in 1908 he received 58 votes as Presidential candidate at the Republican convention that nominated Taft.

"Uncle Joe" was of a type of the western pioneer of which there are no more. He was plain, honest, rugged, and old-fashioned, and remained so throughout his life. High position did not change him in the least.

With his unlit stogie, cocked at a saucy angle so that it almost touched the broad brim of his great black hat, always with him, he presented a picture that no one who ever saw him will ever forget. He was never cartooned without that famous stogie.

Joseph G. Cannon was a pioneer of the type that has passed forever. We shall never see his like again. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SABATH). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, when after nearly a half century of service in this House, longer than that of any other man, dead or alive, Joseph Gurney Cannon came down the main aisle, leaning upon the arm of a colleague, and passed out of yonder door never to return, it was amid silence and deep regret and with the affection and esteem of his fellow Members, regardless of party affiliations.

Soon thereafter he passed into the Great Beyond. Congress was not then in session to do him honor. But upon convening on December 7, 1926, the House of Representa-

tives, in which were many Members who, like myself, had served with Mr. Cannon, adopted a resolution which expressed the true and sincere regard in which he was held, and adjourned in his honor. It was an unusual distinction accorded to an unusual man. That resolution so truly portrayed his character and was such a just and fitting tribute to his memory that I shall here quote it:

Hon. Joseph G. Cannon died in Danville, Ill., November 12, 1926. For 46 years he had been a Member of this House; for 10 years as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; for 8 years its Speaker; and for several years chairman of the Committee on Rules. His service terminated with the Sixty-seventh Congress. Within this Chamber the scene of his life's greatest activities was laid. Here he rendered services to his country which placed him in the front rank of American statesmanship. Here he exhibited characteristics which compelled respect and won admiration. Forceful ability, intrinsic worth, strength of character, brought him popular fame and congressional leadership. In him, depth and breadth of intellect, with a full and well-rounded development, had produced a giant who towered above his fellows and impressed them with his power and wisdom. A distinguished statesman, a lofty patriot, a unique orator, an unmatched debater, a master of logic and wit, the great and representative citizen of the American Republic has gone into history.

Joseph Gurney Cannon, or "Uncle Joe", as he was affectionately called, was a North Carolina cracker, and, like Lincoln, went to Indiana, and, like Lincoln, settled in Illinois. He entered Congress when Blaine was Speaker. In his first speech in 1874 on a bill to reduce postage on books, periodicals, and papers, he said of himself that he had oats in his pocket and hayseed in his hair. In that speech he presented a standard for Congressmen, to which he always conformed. "No man", he said, "is a proper person to represent the people unless he has the honesty and the backbone to stand and do what is right and for the interest of the people, without reference to what anyone may say of him or what the action of the press may be in the premises."

This was "Uncle Joe's" creed, and he lived up to it. Courage was his dominant characteristic. He was an old-time economist. He hated and would fight any measure that looked like a raid on the Treasury. Withal he was constructive. Many governmental agencies had their genesis in his brain.

Mr. Cannon wielded greater influence upon the destiny of legislation than any other man in Congress in over four decades. But he was not an autocrat. When Speaker of the House he exercised no greater powers than had his predecessors; not as much as some. He never lost sight of the fact that he was the House's servant. The issue of "Cannonism", raised in 1910, was factious and fortuitous. "Uncle Joe" was a political target under a hot barrage of coalition fire, but he never flinched. His deft to oust him from the Speakership was magnificent and won even the admiration of his political enemies.

He was a stormy petrel throughout his long public career and loved a fight. He did not harbor animosities and was generous to friend and foe alike. Notwithstanding Speaker Clark's leadership in the memorable battle against "Cannonism", Clark and Cannon were very warm friends. Both men were much beloved for their rugged honesty and stalwart political convictions.

On the eve of his departure from Congress one of his friends said to him: "Uncle Joe, I am sad to think of your going." "Well, my boy", he replied, "it makes me sad, too. But I am an old man, and I ought to have gone out before, because I haven't been worth a damn around here for 2 years except to help make a quorum."

A statesman, a commanding figure, a great American, a unique character, a gentleman of the old school, a man of the people like unto Abraham Lincoln, of whom history will record:

He had the courage of his convictions and the approbation of his own conscience.

Upon the announcement of the death of "Uncle Joe" Cannon, an old employee, whose service in the House was contemporaneous with that of Mr. Cannon for many years, wrote what he styled a "parliamentary ode" to "Uncle Joe", which, in view of Mr. Cannon's eminent services upon the

floor and in the Speaker's chair, is peculiarly appropriate to one so long in the atmosphere of parliamentary struggles. The parliamentary ode is as follows:

Here the gavel fell.
The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.
The previous question is ordered.
Debate is exhausted.
The subject is closed to amendment.
Points of order cannot be made nor reserved.
The Speaker has left the chair and gone into the Committee of the Whole,
Where the point of "no quorum" is never raised,
Where the great majority rules, and
From whence no adverse report ever comes;
Where no dilatory motions are entertained, nor
Filibustering practiced;
Where minorities claim no rights,
Where rules are superfluous, decorum is preserved, and
Where politics is adjourned.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, since the gavel usually beats us to the last sentence, I want to say first what I would wish to reserve for the last.

Mr. Speaker, considering the disparity between Joseph G. Cannon and myself, at that time a disparity in age, in birth, in background, in politics, in association, in experience, a disparity in almost everything that could distinguish two men, and culminating in my induction into the House of Representatives under his iron rule, perhaps the most sincere tribute one such man can pay to another such man is to say that during the quarter century which has elapsed since I last saw him, I have always remembered him never with any feeling of rancor but always with a feeling of affection.

Emerson said that when we see a great man he explains his fame. Joseph G. Cannon was truly self-explanatory. He was original, he was picturesque, he was colorful, he was dramatic, he was dynamic, he was courageous, above all things he was, as the minority leader has just said, highly courageous, and all these qualities were reflected in his personality.

To me it is a solemn and impressive thought that for a half century, one-third of the life of the Republic, with only two short intervals, these walls looked down upon the form and resounded to the voice of Joseph G. Cannon. I think it is highly fitting that the House of Representatives should pause for a half hour in its labors to pay tribute to this truly remarkable man.

I lay no claim to a monopoly of affection for Uncle Joe Cannon. It was general. What was the secret of this universal feeling toward a man who as Speaker won the title of "Czar" Cannon and made "Cannonism" a national political issue? My answer is this, that while in the chair he ruled with an iron hand, embodying in himself all the powers of the House and wielding that power as a partisan and even factional leader; out of the chair he was utterly democratic, approachable, and companionable, chatting freely with the newest and humblest Member of the House. If he was a hearty hater, he was also a hearty lover. He was a red-blooded man. He was a "natural." This, in my opinion, was the secret of his long, successful public career.

If I may, I should like to take him down out of the Speaker's station and relate an incident or two on the personal, the human, side. If I mention myself in one of these incidents, it is only for the purpose of showing that he was what I have just said he was, for certainly there was no mutual-admiration society existing between "Czar" Cannon at the height of his power and a young western Democrat serving his first term. The occasion was a House vote on the veto by President Taft of an immigration bill. The Senate had overridden the veto by 4 to 1. The House was expected to follow suit, though by a smaller margin. Debate was limited to 1 hour. I had been given 1 minute. Feeling was so high that I surrendered the minute, then, regaining my courage, I recovered the time and used it. I was for the veto; the Speaker was for it. When the roll was called,

it lacked five votes of the necessary two-thirds, and the veto was sustained. "Uncle Joe" came down out of the chair, sat down beside me, placed his arm across my shoulders, and said, "Young man, your speech saved the President's veto. You knocked just enough of them off the fence."

I recall my first contact with him. I said, "Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member from Colorado." And he replied dryly, "They generally are."

Here is an instance of his tolerance and unconventionality. While it involved myself, I did not see it, as you will see. I walked into the Chamber while the House was in session, took my seat with my hat on, and sat there smoking a cigar and reading a paper. A Member on the other side signaled the Speaker, who looked down at me for a moment with an indulgent smile and then looked away. In a few minutes I got up and went to the cloakroom, where I was followed by two or three Members, who related what had happened. "Uncle Joe" overlooked a fine chance, which was not unappreciated by me.

It was my privilege once to hear an observation from him which showed his indifference to criticism. He was sitting on the Democratic side chatting with the Republican floor leader. They were just in front of my seat. A Member down in the well was flaying "Cannonism." The gentleman with Speaker Cannon said, "Mr. Speaker, you had better listen to that fellow; he is talking about you." "Oh, well," rejoined "Uncle Joe", "he might be talking about a damn sight worse subject", and continued with his conversation.

I have always remembered the little two-chair table in the House restaurant just at the left-hand side of the door. On the second morning of the historic struggle against the Speaker in 1910 I walked into the deserted restaurant and sat down at this table. In a moment the Speaker came in and sat opposite me. He knew that I was thirsting for his blood, politically speaking, but he chatted unconcernedly. I remember one thing he said, and that was that he answered every letter he received from a constituent, even if it was only two lines. Yes; "Uncle Joe" was a politician as well as a statesman.

If I could pick some one thing for every old man in the United States to read, including every man who thinks he is old, it would be this: In the Sixty-second Congress, after "Uncle Joe" had been "dethroned", and after he had lost the Speakership through change in party control of the House, and when he was 75 years of age, I saw him make a 3-hour speech in the House, during which he paced the center aisle from the Well to the main entrance many times, throwing his arms in characteristic fashion and never sparing himself. It was a truly remarkable performance.

Mr. Speaker, just before rising, I told my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that I would not have time to give more than a sentence of a story I told him the other day about the culmination of that most dramatic struggle in the history of Congress, at the time Speaker Cannon was stripped of his power, when Congress remained in session continuously for 3 days and 2 nights. After the battle was over and he had been shorn of his power, and even his tenure of office was trembling in balance, with the threat running through the House that he should be unseated as Speaker, he took the Speaker's chair and breathed defiance to his foes. He uttered one word in his characteristic manner, which was the high light of that whole dramatic struggle and the high light of his character, when he drew himself to his full height and shouted "Courage!" [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] for 5 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great distinction to be one of those permitted to speak briefly on this one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Gurney Cannon. It is very fitting that the House of Representatives should pause from its daily routine to pay respect to the memory of one who for 46 years was such an important as well as unique figure in its life.

It is not necessary to make direct reference to his great contribution to American history; but as it is now more than 10 years since he retired from this body, those of us who were privileged to serve with him can perhaps contribute to this record by personal reminiscences.

My first contact with "Uncle Joe" was soon after his memorable fight in the House to retain his position as Speaker. He came to Massachusetts to deliver an address. It was my privilege to attend the dinner. I can see him now after the lapse of nearly 30 years, describing his experience in that disagreement with his party associates. The fire in his eye, the vigor of his speech, and the spirit of his remarks were typical of his strength here.

I first sat on this floor as a Member-elect to the Sixty-third Congress during the closing sessions of the Sixty-second when so many Members were retiring as the result of political upheavals. An ex-Speaker and a future Speaker were among that number, "Uncle Joe" Cannon and Nick Longworth. I can recount a most interesting experience during the Sixty-third Congress when "Uncle Joe" came to see us as a visitor and was a guest of honor at a dinner at the Army and Navy Club given by former Representative Chipperfield. Among the guests was James R. Mann. The dinner was about half over when Speaker Champ Clark came in, the only Democrat among 50 Republicans. The speeches that "Uncle Joe" and Champ Clark made that night are outstanding memories in my membership, both reminiscing not only of the old days here but of their days back home in Illinois and Missouri.

One other personal word about "Uncle Joe." One very hot summer afternoon I asked him to ride home with me. We drove around the Speedway. I said to him, "Uncle Joe", the time is coming when you should write your personal reminiscences of your remarkable public career. No one can do it for you, and you owe it to the country to make a record of your service." He turned to me and said, "Young man, I have always made it a rule to look forward, never backward." The wonderful impression left by that remark of a man then over fourscore years has never left me; and from it I learned a great lesson, that we should endeavor to keep ourselves young as he did and improve the future rather than have regrets for the past.

Another reminiscence is the memorable ride I had in the train from New York one day with Champ Clark, when he gave me the complete story of the effort to retire "Uncle Joe" and its failure. Many a delightful evening did I, as a new Member, spend with "Uncle Joe" during our summer sessions in the Sixty-fifth Congress.

One of "Uncle Joe's" most renowned speeches was that made in support of a bill to create the American Academy of Arts and Letters, in which he recalled the pioneer days of his youth, when he began his journey westward with his parents from North Carolina. Listen to these words, which typify his powers as an orator:

Now, then, take art. I do not know how many of you have gone to the western end of the Capitol and seen on the wall that picture entitled, *Westward the Star of the Empire Takes Its Way*. A great artist, I cannot recall his name now, painted that picture on the wall. There it is. It represents the pioneer from the Atlantic coast on his way westward.

There are the steer and the mule hitched up together; there is the woman with the babe in her arms, sitting in the wagon; there is the little grave by the side of the road; and there is the pioneer with his coonskin cap and the little boy with his coonskin cap, the grandson or the son, carrying a rifle, followed by the faithful dog; another stands upon the mountain and looks to the westward.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, I was a part of that picture in a way, and by that I mean I experienced most of what it represented in the pioneer days; and as I looked upon that picture the first time, though I am not given much to tears, I caught myself crying. And during all the years since, I have never glanced toward it without saying to myself, "God bless the man who painted that picture."

May I close these personal remarks with a reference to the last session "Uncle Joe" attended, on March 4, 1923? Mr. Sisson, of Mississippi, made these remarks:

It has been my pleasure to know "Uncle Joe" intimately. I have learned to love him deeply, and it will be a source of satisfaction all my life to be able to say that I have known intimately one of

the greatest men and one of the greatest characters that America has produced. When the history of this House is written, as it will be, when the history of the Speakers has been written, "Uncle Joe" Cannon will stand out in bold relief as one of the greatest men who has ever occupied this position in the history of this country.

My colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Gallivan], in the course of his remarks, inserted a story from the Baltimore Sun entitled "Shed a Tear for 'Uncle Joe' as He Is Leaving Us Today." A truthful title. Certainly there was many a wet eye in this Chamber when the good-byes were said to "Uncle Joe." How strange it is to read in that article that when "Uncle Joe" was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Professor Langley, of the Smithsonian Institute, asked for an appropriation of \$10,000 to experiment in flying. "Great heavens," exclaimed Mr. Cannon, "a flying machine to ride in the air. Whoever heard of such a thing?"

The article also contains many other interesting details, including a poem that "Uncle Joe" quoted when his length of service exceeded that of Mr. Morrill.

For the accuracy of history and the real judgment of the future, sufficient time has not elapsed in which to rate the character, personality, and service of "Uncle Joe" Cannon, but we can say that while America has produced many great men, to this day, in our judgment, it has not produced the like of "Uncle Joe." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MEEKS].

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to have been associated with Joseph G. Cannon in any official way. I knew him better as a citizen of my home town, Danville, Ill., and as a neighbor. He was the first Congressman I ever saw. I remember the incident distinctly when I looked through a window of his bank and saw him with his arms folded, standing erect and alert, looking at a map on the floor and discussing something with a caller who was interested in what was shown on the map. I was a farm lad then. I thought he represented the power and majesty of the United States Government.

Shortly after I was admitted to the bar I was a guest in his home with other members of the county bar, and I considered that a great event. It was the first time a Congressman spoke to me. I felt greatly honored by this attention. I was interested in all his later political campaigns, not as an associate, of course, but often as a participant, and I know well his political history at home. He was a unique, picturesque character, a forceful individual. I never saw another like him.

His history, however, would not be complete without the mention of an associate who always aided and sustained him in his official career until he became Speaker of the House. I refer to his brother, William P. Cannon, who was an able businessman and an astute political general who managed his campaign battles and who always rallied to his support in every contest in which Joseph G. Cannon engaged. He lost his life as the result of an accident shortly after his brother became Speaker. The association of these two men was a remarkable business and political partnership of two brothers.

Joseph G. Cannon was a man of the soil. He came to the prairies of Illinois after he had lived in Indiana. In early life he was a district prosecuting attorney riding the circuit as did the judges in those days. He was somewhat Lincolnesque in thought and spoke the language all could understand. He came to Washington at the close of an epoch and the beginning of a new. His life was identified with much of the history of this country. I suggested to him once that he write his memoirs because of their great value as a contribution to the history of this country and the intimate glimpses it would give of unrecorded official acts in our national life. I know of no other man who could have written memoirs of so great value. [Applause.] He declined to consider the subject on the grounds that he was too old for such long and exacting labor. The history of our country would have been enriched by this contribution.

At home, although we recognize the fact that Mr. Cannon was a great figure in the Nation's life, yet it was not as such

that we thought of him mostly. He was a neighbor, a friend, a useful man in the community with simple habits and tastes and one upon whom we did not look with awe.

As a young man he settled upon the prairies of Illinois and was influenced by its expanse, its hard-working settlers, men and women who made a great State in a raw country. His travelings upon the circuit, his contacts with honest, earnest folks of the countryside, and small towns prepared him for his great usefulness and achievements in national affairs. He was a part of the community. He was usually called and referred to as Joe. It was not until he had lived the allotted span of human life that he was called "Uncle Joe." He cared little for the formalities and conventionalities of social life. There was nothing of show and glamor about him. His constituents understood him. They did not expect from him sonorous eloquent utterances. They expected him to speak the ordinary language which they all easily understood. He had no patronizing ways. He felt at home mingling with farmers and enjoying in their homes the ample meals which they served. He liked to talk with them about their problems and pleasures. He knew business in its various aspects. He knew farming. He knew about coal mining. He knew the country store, the country church, the country school. He soon became a familiar figure with his big black cigar and slouch hat. He was natural for he breathed the air of the expansive prairies. He upheld the majestic woodlands which abound in his district and the glories of abundant nature. He was inspired with the interests of his people.

Of course, we were all pleased when he became Speaker. It was at this point that he lost his brother William and at which another figure of importance came into his political life, his son-in-law, E. X. Leseure, whom I knew well and who was a friend of mine. His daughter, now Mrs. Abdill, occupies the old homestead on the principal street of the town.

It was the purpose of the people of Danville who knew him so long to hold memorial exercises on his one hundredth birthday. I am a member of the committee on arrangements. It has been decided to postpone the event until later in the year.

I have heard much about his courage, his determination to pursue a course which he wanted adopted against any opposition which might arise. His character was no enigma to those who knew him on the home ground. His struggle with early adversity on the undeveloped prairies of Illinois, where malaria, milk sick, and many other disorders prevailed, and where the hardest labor was necessary to wring from the soil sufficient crops to provide clothing and shelter for the large families, made him one of them.

These were elements which developed strong characteristics in individuals and Joseph G. Cannon was not exceptional as to these influences. They marked his life. When he came to Washington it was not with a polish acquired in society nor with the cultivated speech of the orator, which in those days swayed crowds, but with the sturdy traits natural to the individual qualified by hard knocks. They were necessary to one's survival and necessary for the achievement of great things.

Joseph G. Cannon came into notice immediately following the noted characters who made outstanding history in Illinois. These were Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, James C. Robinson, Usher F. Linder, Leonard Swett, Lawrence Weldon, David Davis, Oliver L. Davis, and among them but not the least of them, Daniel W. Voorhees, "The Tall Sycamore of the Wabash." These men were eminent lawyers in that period before many important decisions were made by our Supreme Court. Cannon and others took up the work where the former men left off. Necessarily, his name goes along with those in the annals of old Illinois and with its place in the Nation.

The narrative of these simple facts shows whence came those characteristics in the halls of Congress to which you have listened today. I saw him when I was a farm boy, and I saw him when the people of our city tendered to him, after his retirement—and to the Honorable Joseph B. Mann, the

best all-around lawyer I have ever known—a memorial dinner and tribute. They were almost the same age, both retired and looking back upon earthly careers about to end. It was a notable event and scene. It was my privilege to see Mr. Cannon as a Congressman when I was a lad and my privilege to see him in my own office shortly before his death. There were intimate conversations. Although belonging to different political parties, this, on many occasions, was not a cause of differences between us. I shall always feel that it was worth something to have known him, that it was worth much to have him an important part of our national life, and to have had him in our community as a neighbor and as a friend. This sentiment cannot be erased nor obscured by any outstanding public career. After all, the great question is what kind of a man was one of whom we speak. I have attempted in these remarks to show something of the kind of man Joseph G. Cannon was, which, I think, will tend to explain the characteristics observed in him by his colleagues in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, if there ever served in this body a typical outgrowth of American ideals and institutions, it was the late Speaker Joseph Cannon, whom we have assembled to honor today.

This statesman whose memory we all cherish met every test and trial from his birth in North Carolina 100 years ago until the pale messenger approached his bedside at Danville, Ill., November 12, 1926.

It was my privilege and advantage to know him, to have voted for his reelection as Speaker of this House at the Sixty-first Congress, March 19, 1910. I have since served under Speakers Clark, Gillette, Rainey, and our own patient, able, and fair and esteemed Speaker, Mr. BYRNS. It was also my privilege to have served under Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, and now President Roosevelt.

To be the only Republican now a Member of this body who voted in the Sixty-first Congress to elect Mr. Cannon Speaker, is an embarrassing distinction, for I feel my weakness in attempting to render in words such tribute to the grand old statesman as his memory deserves.

Although born in North Carolina, he had his mental and physical growth in the Middle West, at a time when men of the type of Lincoln and Grant and others who drew from the forest and plain that kind of rugged manhood and burning patriotism that has shown across the pages of history ever since.

Speaker Cannon was a type possessed of characteristics that grew and flourished on the broad philosophy of common sense.

It is yet too early in the march of time and understanding of this type of men who helped build the Republic strong and enduring, to set down a correct estimate of their contributions to our progress and civilization. When it is recalled that it was 250 years after the death of Cromwell that Thomas Carlyle ventured an estimate of Cromwell's purpose and accomplishments, our task today may be better understood, for aside from decapitating Charles I and destroying or making Ireland unhappy for many years, we see nothing of special note, with the return of Charles II, upon the failure of Cromwell's son to carry on.

It has been so as to the genius of Napoleon, which in military mastery and democratic progress and the immortal code, for it has been 115 years since he died and the recent book by Ludwig is the only fair estimate we have yet found excepting in a work by Thomas Watson, of Georgia, formerly a Member of this body.

Therefore we may not expect to have the virtues of Speaker Cannon portrayed or the value of his life to his country and the world understood and translated so soon after he passed from the stage of earthly activities, swift competition, and the asperities which hedge about us all, particularly in a life of political service which an economist has declared to be only a little less violent than war, hence politics must be encompassed by stern realities.

We have evidence of the fine judgment and confidence in him, and another grand old commoner, Champ Clark, when for their good judgment and honesty these two men were placed among those who erected the first House Office Building and the Lincoln Monument.

As an evidence of Speaker Cannon's good judgment in selecting advisers he had as his counselors, in what was characterized a "kitchen cabinet", Senators James Watson, of Indiana; James Sherman, of New York; James Tawney, of Michigan; James Mann, of Illinois; and James Heminway, of Indiana. The five Jims. And three of these Jims later became United States Senators and one a Vice President.

"Uncle Joe" Cannon freely extended the hand of fellowship to new men coming to Congress in form of sound advice. I sought his counsel on more than one occasion, and he directed me aright. I recall one instance when I was anxious to have a bill passed. I spoke to Mr. Cannon and he gave directions how to comply with the somewhat different rules than I had been familiar with in the Pennsylvania Senate and Assembly, but was afraid to ask that a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and lay that motion on the table believing such action could not possibly be ethical. But "Uncle Joe" replied that that was the practice, and in fact is now.

Probably the climaxing triumph of his life came when he completely routed an element of the Republican Party which sought to divest him of his power as Speaker. This pursuit was carried across the country, and all Republicans had to meet the issue and win or lose for or against Cannonism. Truth is, the Cannon rules were the same as the Crisp, Randall, and Reed rules used before his advent. But the showdown came on March 19, 1910, and it was a day fraught with the most dramatic and truly thrilling situations I ever witnessed in conventions and legislative bodies. I was witness to it all and followed as I could the strategy of Speaker Cannon, James Watson, of Indiana, and William A. Rodenberg, of the Twenty-second Illinois District. Every minute was tense, but the House came out of every charge straight and erect under the rules that the motion to adjourn had to be first acted upon before the resolution offered by Congressman Burleson could be voted up or down.

Here I wish to insert Mr. Cannon's short speech, which time will mark and perpetuate as a classic defense of his position under the rules.

THE FAMOUS RESOLUTION DEFEATED

After prolonged and heated discussion on the resolution introduced by Congressman Burleson, of Texas, the Speaker pro tempore said:

The yeas and nays have been ordered on the resolution. The Clerk will call the roll. As many as are in favor of the adoption of the resolution will, as their names are called, answer "yea", those opposed will answer "nay"; and again the Chair cautions the House to keep in order during the roll call.

The resolution read as follows:

Resolved, That the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby declared vacant, and the House of Representatives shall at once proceed to the election of a Speaker.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 155, nays 192, answered "present" 8, not voting 33.

The only present Republican Member of Congress who voted against the resolution was BENJAMIN K. FOCHT, of the Eighteenth Pennsylvania District.

SPEECH OF "UNCLE JOE" CANNON

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and to lay that motion upon the table. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Speaker asks the indulgence of the House for not exceeding 3 minutes to make a statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to withhold the motion.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Cannon). Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, actions, not words, determine the conduct and the sincerity of men in the affairs of life. This is a government by the

people acting through the representatives of a majority of the people. Results cannot be had except by a majority; and in the House of Representatives a majority, being responsible, should have full power and should exercise that power, otherwise the majority is inefficient and does not perform its functions. The office of the minority is to put the majority on its good behavior, advocating, in good faith, the policies which it professes, ever ready to take advantage of the mistakes of the majority party, and appeal to the country for its vindication.

From time to time heretofore the majority has become the minority, as in the present case, and from time to time hereafter the majority will become the minority. The country believes that the Republican Party has a majority of 44 in the House of Representatives at this time, yet such is not the case.

The present Speaker of the House has, to the best of his ability and judgment, cooperated with the Republican Party; and so far in the history of this Congress the Republican Party in the House has been enabled by a very small majority, when the test came, to legislate in conformity with the policies and the platform of the Republican Party. Such action, of course, begot criticism—which the Speaker does not deprecate—on the part of the minority party.

The Speaker cannot be unmindful of the fact, as evidenced by three previous elections to the speakership, that in the past he has enjoyed the confidence of the Republican Party of the country and of the Republican Members of the House; but the assault upon the Speaker of the House by the minority, supplemented by the efforts of the so-called insurgents, shows that the Democratic minority, aided by a number of so-called insurgents, constituting 15 percent of the majority party in the House, is now in the majority, and that the Speaker of the House is not in harmony with the actual majority of the House, as evidenced by the vote just taken.

There are two courses open for the Speaker to pursue—one is to resign and permit the new combination of Democrats and insurgents to choose a Speaker in harmony with its aims and purposes. The other is for that combination to declare a vacancy in the office of Speaker and proceed to the election of a new Speaker. After consideration, at this stage of the session of the House, with much of important legislation pending involving the pledges of the Republican platform and their crystallization into law, believing that his resignation might consume weeks of time in the reorganization of the House, the Speaker, being in harmony with Republican policies and desirous of carrying them out, declines by his own motion to precipitate a contest upon the House in the election of a new Speaker; a contest that might greatly endanger the final passage of all legislation necessary to redeem Republican pledges and fulfill Republican promises. This is one reason why the Speaker does not resign at once; and another reason is this: In the judgment of the present Speaker, a resignation is in and of itself a confession of weakness or mistake or an apology for past actions. The Speaker is not conscious of having done any political wrong. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] The same rules are in force in this House that have been in force for two decades. The Speaker has construed the rules as he found them and as they have been construed by previous Speakers from Thomas B. Reed's incumbency down to the present time.

Heretofore the Speakers have been members of the Committee on Rules, covering a period of 60 years, and the present Speaker has neither sought new power nor has he unjustly used that already conferred upon him.

There has been much talk on the part of the minority and the insurgents of the "czarism" of the Speaker, culminating in the action taken today. The real truth is that there is no coherent Republican majority in the House of Representatives. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Therefore, the real majority ought to have the courage of its convictions [applause on the Republican side] and logically meet the situation that confronts it.

The Speaker does now believe, and always has believed, that this is a government through parties, and that parties can act only through majorities. The Speaker has always believed in and bowed to the will of the majority in convention, in caucus, and in the legislative hall, and today profoundly believes that to act otherwise is to disorganize parties, is to prevent coherent action in any legislative body, is to make impossible the reflection of the wishes of the people in statutes and in laws.

The Speaker has always said that, under the Constitution, it is a question of the highest privilege for an actual majority of the House at any time to choose a new Speaker, and again notifies the House that the Speaker will at this moment, or at any other time while he remains Speaker, entertain, in conformity with the highest constitutional privilege, a motion by any Member to vacate the office of Speakership and choose a new Speaker [loud applause on the Republican side]; and, under existing conditions, would welcome such action upon the part of the actual majority of the House, so that power and responsibility may rest with the Democratic and insurgent Members who, by the last vote, evidently constitute a majority of this House. The Chair is now ready to entertain such motion. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Republican side; great confusion in the Hall.]

In conclusion let me observe that, as Shakespeare made Marc Antony say in his majestic oration that his heart was in Caesar's coffin, I believe that on this day, the one hundredth anniversary of Mr. Cannon's birth, there will be countless thousands who will recall his life with admiration and affection. Solon, the Greek philosopher and codifier of the laws of his country, admonished Croesus that nothing which

might vanish can bring perpetual joy, and our departed friend of whom we have humbly spoken was free from all vain conceit, and we believe, with Solon, that "him only to whom the divinity has continued happiness unto the end we call happy."

The last days of Speaker Cannon were spent at his home at Danville, Ill., in the peace and quietude of the sear and yellow leaf of life, drawing solace and consolation from the philosophy and spiritual glow of the Holy Bible, and passing into the shadows beloved and lamented.

CONTRIBUTION BY HON. WILLIAM A. RODENBERG, WHO REPRESENTED THE TWENTY-SECOND ILLINOIS DISTRICT IN CONGRESS AT THE TIME, MARCH 19, 1910

Today is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of a great American, who occupied a commanding position in national affairs for half a century. On May 7, 1836, Joseph Gurney Cannon was born at Guilford, N. C. His parents belonged to the Society of Friends, familiarly known as Quakers. In 1840, when Joseph was 4 years of age, the family moved to Bloomingdale, Ind., where some years later the father, who was a practicing physician, lost his life while attempting to ford a swollen stream on his way to call on a patient. The good doctor left his family in moderate circumstances, and at an early age Joseph secured employment as clerk in a country store, thus enabling him to contribute to the support of the family.

On one occasion, as a youth of about 20, he attended a famous trial in Bloomingdale, and so impressed was he by the eloquent arguments of the attorneys in the case that he resolved then and there to become a lawyer. By practicing the strictest economy he was able to save enough to spend a year at the Cincinnati Law School. In 1858, at the age of 22, he was admitted to the bar and commenced practice in Terre Haute, Ind. Not meeting with much success, he decided to migrate to Chicago, which then gave every evidence of becoming a great metropolis. The story is told—and I am sure that it is authentic—that his funds become exhausted long before reaching Chicago and that, upon the urgent solicitation of the conductor, he was compelled to leave the train at Tuscola, which had just been designated as the county seat of Douglas County, Ill. Undaunted and undismayed, the hero of this sketch proceeded to the only tavern in the new town, explained his predicament to the proprietor, and asked for "room and board" until such time as he might be able to pay. The proprietor was impressed by the earnestness of the young man's plea and consented to the arrangement. In later years Mr. Cannon was wont to tell with much relish that his first legal fee was 50 cents for writing a deed. In 1861, or 2 years after his arrival in Tuscola, he was elected State's attorney for the twenty-seventh judicial district of Illinois, which position he held until December 1868. His incumbency of the office of State's attorney covered the exciting days of the Civil War, and no civil officer in the great State of Illinois rendered more effective or patriotic service to the cause of the Union than Joseph G. Cannon. Douglas County was one of the hotbeds of southern sympathizers, and, despite threats of personal violence, the aggressive young State's attorney did not hesitate to prosecute them fearlessly and relentlessly. His activities in this crucial time in the Nation's history established a bond of undying personal friendship between himself and the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

In 1872, at the beginning of President Grant's second term, Mr. Cannon was elected to Congress, and with two intermissions he continued as a Member of Congress from 1873 to 1923, covering a period of 50 years of the most momentous history of the world. For 46 years he was a Member of this body, which up to now has established a record for all time.

For 8 years, from 1903 to 1911, "Uncle Joe", as he was known to every man, woman, and child in America, presided as Speaker of the House. There are only seven Members of the present Congress who had the honor and distinction of serving under his Speakership: The present distinguished Speaker, JOSEPH W. BYRNS, the beloved dean of the House; ADOLPH J. SABATH and JAMES MCANDREWS, of Illinois; EDWARD T. TAYLOR and JOHN A. MARTIN, of Colorado; WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK, of Ohio; and he who is now addressing you, Mr. FOCHT, of Pennsylvania.

I account it an honor and a privilege, which I am sure is shared by the others whom I have just mentioned, to pay tribute on this centennial anniversary of his birth, to the memory of the hero of a thousand legislative battles, a man of character, of courage, of integrity, of patriotism, who had justly endeared himself to posterity as one of the Nation's idols, "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, born May 7, 1836, and called to his reward on November 12, 1926. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who served under the former Speaker of this House, Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, I cannot refrain from saying just a word with reference to my great admiration and my very real affection for him and his memory.

When I came to Congress he had begun his last term as Speaker. In the next Congress his party assigned him as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I had the honor to be a member.

It was my privilege to sit beside him in one of the important subcommittees of that committee during the consideration of bills pending before it. Because of this close association I came to know him intimately during this time. As a member of that committee he showed the same courage, the same loyal regard for his country, the same earnest desire to protect the Treasury of the United States during this time that I am sure he had shown during the time he was chairman of that great committee before he was elected Speaker.

Mr. Cannon was one of the truly great men of his time. Some of us differed from him upon policies of government, but no one ever questioned his honesty, his sincerity, or his patriotism, and he wielded an influence second to none, not only in that committee but in the Congress. As we all know, he was known to his colleagues in the House as "Uncle Joe", a term of affection and endearment; in fact, he was so known all over this country, and when after many, many years of public service he felt it necessary to voluntarily retire, a short time before his death there was not a Member on either side of the Chamber who did not feel a sense of deep personal regret, and there is no Member who ever served with him who will not always remember him for his loyalty and his patriotism. He was one of the last of the Speakers who had the responsibility and the privilege of naming the standing committees of the House. He was the last of the Speakers who was chairman of the Committee on Rules, a committee, as I recall, consisting of five members, and the committee which shaped the policy and the program of the House. He exercised tremendous power, but he was always fair and just. Of course, he fought vigorously for those things in which he believed. He never surrendered a principle, but I feel that every man who ever served under him felt that "Uncle Joe" was anxious to see that every Member had all the privileges that he should have upon the floor of this House.

I will always remember and feel proud of the fact that it was my privilege to serve under him as Speaker for one term and then to serve with him in the Committee on Appropriations where I gathered wisdom from his earnest, patriotic, and sincere efforts to protect the Treasury of the United States and his great legislative experience. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that not only those who have spoken but that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD with reference to the late Speaker Cannon for 5 legislative days, and may I make the observation, Mr. Speaker, that one of his oldest friends desired time, but, unfortunately, it was impossible for me to yield to him and, therefore, I especially desire that he should have the privilege of extending his remarks. I refer to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MCANDREWS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being a Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress, when Uncle Joe Cannon was first elected to the Speakership of the House. At that time he was 67 years of age, had already served more than a quarter of a century in Congress, but there was no Member of the House who was more vigorous, physically and intellectually, than Uncle Joe. He seemed to be in the very prime of life and towered like a giant among his fellow Members. He was a master of debate, forceful, courageous, and resourceful, neither asking nor giving quarter. With a wealth of knowledge gained in the

great school of human experience, the school that has given to the Nation many of its best and greatest statesmen, Joseph G. Cannon was thoroughly equipped for legislative work. His memory was most remarkable and he could draw on his wonderful store of knowledge of men and events without the slightest hesitation. Whenever he addressed himself to any subject of public interest he always commanded the rapt attention of the House, because every Member felt that Uncle Joe would throw real light and information on the subject under discussion. He never talked simply to be talking. He believed that the time of the House was too valuable to be wasted in idle chatter.

While an intense partisan of the old school, yet he was always so frank, so fair, and so disarming in his inherent honesty that he commanded the full respect of all of us who sat on the Democratic side of the House. When Uncle Joe was elected to his first term as Speaker, the brilliant and versatile John Sharpe Williams, of Mississippi, was elevated to the position of minority leader. Upon the end of the first day of the new Congress, John Sharpe called on the newly elected Speaker and, after extending his personal congratulations, observed, "Uncle Joe, now that you are our Speaker, I hope that during your incumbency you will always treat the Democratic side fairly and justly." Uncle Joe grasped the minority leader's hand and replied: "John Sharpe, I will be as fair and just as the exigencies of politics will permit me to be." Incidentally, there was never any interruption in the cordial personal relations between Uncle Joe and John Sharpe Williams, or his illustrious successor as minority leader, the greatly beloved Champ Clark, of Missouri.

It was my good fortune to come into close personal contact with Mr. Cannon, and the memory of that delightful friendship will abide with me until the end of time. I admired and loved him for his many kindly human qualities. He was the very soul of personal and political courage and integrity. While tenacious in his political opinions, knowing him as I knew him, I feel justified in saying that Uncle Joe never knowingly did an injustice to any human being. Broad in his sympathies and always tolerant in his views, he endeared himself to his legion of friends and commanded the respect and admiration of those who were politically opposed to him. "Of such is the kingdom of the heaven that I hope to inhabit."

DIGEST OF TESTIMONY—HOUSE HEARINGS ON \$1,500,000,000 RELIEF PROPOSAL, APRIL 8-13, 1936

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress on March 18, 1936, requesting an appropriation of \$1,500,000,000 for the continuation of the Works Progress Administration through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937. Hearings were held on this proposal April 8-13 before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

At the hearings, the principal witnesses were: Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator of the Works Progress Administration, and Daniel W. Bell, Acting Director of the Budget. The principal points of the testimony at the hearings will here be summarized with interpretative comment.

GENERAL STATUS OF RELIEF FUNDS

The funds requested are in addition to balances from the \$4,880,000,000 appropriated last year for the works program, to be available until June 30, 1937.

Mr. Bell testified that when the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 was approved on April 8, 1935, \$4,576,000,000 was actually available and the remainder had been used to repay transfers previously made to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration out of former appropriations. On March 31, 1936, all of this \$4,576,000,000 had been allocated to specific projects with the exception of \$68,000,000. Of the

\$4,508,000,000 that had been allocated, \$3,466,000,000 had been obligated and \$2,515,000,000 had been actually expended and thus on March 31, 1936, \$2,061,000,000 was unexpended, of which \$1,110,000,000 was unobligated. Monthly expenditures from this fund are being made at the rate of more than \$229,000,000. Mr. Hopkins estimated that something over a billion dollars of the funds appropriated in 1935 for emergency relief would remain unexpended on June 30, 1936. Mr. Bell stated that he believed that approximately \$1,780,000,000 would remain unexpended from funds appropriated by Congress during the period 1933 to 1935 for the purpose of relief.

It is to be noted that with the addition of the proposed \$1,500,000,000 the administration would have nearly \$3,300,000,000, the amount of the original N. I. R. A. appropriation in 1933.

In his message to Congress President Roosevelt estimated that there were at that time about 5,300,000 relief cases, of which 3,800,000 were being cared for by the works program and the remainder by the States. With all the funds available during 1937—the billion and one-half dollars requested, the unknown amount, exceeding \$1,000,000,000, which will remain unexpended on June 30, 1936, from the \$4,880,000,000, and the funds requested for the continuance of the C. C. C. and for the construction of regular Government public works—Mr. Hopkins estimated that only 2,843,000 relief cases could be taken care of through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937. He stated also that he did not believe that the relief load would decline during the next fiscal year.

He went on to admit that he did not believe the funds requested by the President would be sufficient to carry on the work-relief program during the fiscal year 1937. He also stated that it was his personal belief that additional funds would have to be requested from Congress for the continuation of the program to June 30, 1937. Mr. Hopkins estimated that 2,000,000 people could be given work relief for 1 year with the \$1,500,000,000 requested by the President. The cost would then be approximately \$750 per man. At another point in the testimony Mr. Hopkins stated that at the present time work relief under the W. P. A. was costing the Federal Government approximately \$792 per year per man.

All of the new funds requested are ostensibly to be utilized for the Works Progress Administration. This was not true of the \$4,880,000,000 appropriated last year which was earmarked by Congress for certain classes of expenditure. Only \$1,363,926,901 of that sum was allocated to the W. P. A. For the continuation of relief through December 1935, \$938,530,085 was allocated to the F. E. R. A. To the Public Works Administration \$447,476,447 was given. The Resettlement Administration received \$230,308,400 up to March 31, 1936. Five hundred million dollars was allocated for the construction of public roads and grade-crossing elimination. The C. C. C. received \$527,479,450. The rest of the sum was allocated to numerous other agencies.

NEW FUND NOT EXCLUSIVELY FOR W. P. A.

Mr. Hopkins stated on a number of occasions that all of the funds requested would be utilized for the continuation of the W. P. A. But this is not accurate, as his testimony at another point in the hearings demonstrates. He estimated that \$90,000,000, or 8 percent of the requested fund would be used for rural rehabilitation and direct relief to farmers. When pressed on this point he admitted that this money would be expended through the Resettlement Administration.

(His reticence in admitting that any of these funds would be used for the Resettlement Administration is founded on an obvious reason. If the President or Mr. Hopkins made an outright admission that part of this appropriation would be used for the continuation of the Resettlement Administration there would be a very good reason for calling Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, the Administrator of the Resettlement Administration, to take the stand. Many Members of Congress, both Democratic and Republican, would like to see Mr. Tugwell put on the stand in an investigation. This does not seem to be desired by the administration leaders.)

The complete break-down of the proposed expenditure of this requested billion and one-half dollar fund is as follows: Highways and streets, 29 percent; public buildings, 11 percent; parks, 11 percent; public utilities, water supply, and sanitation, 12 percent; flood control and conservation, 9 percent; white-collar projects, 6 percent; women's projects, 6 percent; national youth administration, 5 percent; rural rehabilitation, 6 percent; and miscellaneous work projects, 5 percent.

In the absence of earmarking in the pending bill, Mr. Hopkins could allocate to the Resettlement Administration portions of the funds covered by other items in this break-down. Or, of course, for that matter, there probably would be nothing to prevent Mr. Hopkins from entirely disregarding this break-down in the expenditure of funds.

ALLOCATION AMONG STATES

When Mr. Hopkins was asked how W. P. A. funds had been allocated among the several States, he answered as follows:

Of course, our wage rate varies in various parts of the country, depending in part on the cost of living. Therefore, that affects, of course, the amount of money in dollars paid in a particular State for the same number of people. It takes fewer dollars to take care of the same number of people in Mississippi than to take care of them in New York. You will find that we have a larger work program in one State than we have in another with the same population, the reason being that the degree of unemployment is greater and the degree of need greater in one State than in another. The program must be adjusted to need (p. 180).

This statement does not indicate the existence of any standards that can be used in allocating funds, as the following data show: Per-capita allocation of W. P. A. funds were as follows (selected States):

New York	\$20.63
Virginia	4.83
Colorado	17.25
Utah	13.71
North Carolina	3.84

These States received the following per-capita total allocations under the act of 1935:

New York	\$43.61
Virginia	23.69
Colorado	56.92
Utah	56.93
North Carolina	18.28

The Works Progress Administration has allocated \$1,113,271,212 to more than 80,000 works projects. Local sponsors will contribute \$254,790,522 for these works projects. Thus the local contribution will average about 18.6 percent. Concerning the method used in determining the contributions to be made by sponsors, Mr. Hopkins had this to say:

Now, the extent of their contribution was determined by the type of work to be done, the financial condition of the local sponsoring agency, and the estimate of the locality's participation in other parts of the program. In that connection you could get a higher percent of contributions for one kind of work than you could for another. Our policy in securing local contributions was a policy of insisting that the local government put up as much as was reasonable. That varies, of course, in various places, and I have no doubt that some injustices were done as between one area and another and as between one State and another. We had to take into consideration the fact that one State had put up a lot of money for Public Works Administration projects. They had put up their money, whereas in another State they may have had no Public Works Administration projects, and consequently had put up no funds. We took all of this into consideration (p. 180).

Let us see what the picture is when the sponsors' contributions are considered by States. In Wyoming sponsors contributed 43 percent of the cost of all projects undertaken, whereas both in West Virginia and in the District of Columbia such contributions were only 8.2 percent. The figures for a few other States follow: Idaho, 40.6 percent; Georgia, 40.3 percent; Rhode Island, 34.1 percent; Vermont, 31.6 percent; and Kentucky, 30.8 percent.

Sponsors' contributions varied widely with the different kinds of projects. Twenty-six percent of the cost of sanitation projects was contributed by sponsors. On the following type of projects the sponsors contributed the indicated percentages: Public buildings, 22.5 percent; highways, 22.2

percent; parks, 11.4 percent; and goods (sewing, canning, etc.), 9.2 percent.

RELIEF STANDARDS NOT CLEAR

Supposedly the program under the Emergency Relief Act of 1935 is for the purpose of giving work relief to unemployed employables on relief. Mr. Hopkins admitted that he had no accurate information concerning the number of unemployed, the number of employables who are unemployed, or the number of people who are registered as being on relief at the present time. The determination of the question of who is and who is not to receive relief is left up to the States. The W. P. A. has not defined standards of what constitutes a person on relief, and no check is exercised over the States in determining who is and who is not to be put on relief. The determination of who is or who is not employable in the last resort is determined by the United States Employment Service or the United States Reemployment Service, which are Federal agencies. The formulation of standards to determine the employable character of a person then rests primarily with the Federal Government, but Mr. Hopkins admits that no such standards have been formulated. Concerning this problem he says:

"Employability is largely a question of the economic condition of the country. That is, when times are booming, almost everybody is employable, then all of a sudden there is a depression and then a lot of people are unemployable and all big industries change their standards of employability. The question of determining who is employable and who is not is a very difficult matter, and I think strict regulations about employability do a real injury to a lot of the people who may have slight injuries—competent, able people" (p. 225).

Yet, in another place in the same hearings, after admitting a lack of data concerning the exact number of those on relief and the number of employables on relief, he asserted that 85 percent of the employables on relief in January 1936 were being taken care of through Federal work-relief projects. How did he know? Of the 3,763,334 persons being employed on the entire work-relief program, exclusive of administrative employees, 364,928, about 9 percent, were not taken from the relief rolls, and 8.4 percent of the pay roll on work-relief projects is being used to pay persons who are not on relief. During March the total administrative staff being paid from this relief appropriation was 144,095.

ACTUAL BENEFITS TO UNEMPLOYED NOT SHOWN

Mr. Hopkins at no point states the man-years of work that will be secured from the \$4,880,000,000 appropriation. In fact, no data are presented in the hearings on which anyone could compute the number of men that could be put to work for 1 year with this sum. There are no data presented in the hearings from which a person could determine how much of this vast sum of money is actually being expended for work-relief purposes and how much is being expended for such visionary purposes as land purchases.

All persons who are given employment on work-relief projects must have been on State relief rolls during the month of November 1935. Mr. Hopkins admitted that there was no logic behind the setting of the November deadline for the determination of who should or who should not be given work relief, and that probably it should be revised.

ALIENS ON RELIEF

Mr. Hopkins also admitted that aliens were receiving work-relief jobs. He did not seem to be able to see anything wrong in this situation. He could furnish no data on the number of aliens who are employed under the work-relief program. He also admitted that aliens illegally admitted to the country were being employed, and he did not appear to believe that this was an undesirable situation.

PROPORTION OF W. P. A. FUNDS SPENT FOR RELIEF LABOR

To employ one man for a year under W. P. A. costs an average of \$972, of which \$600 goes to the man as wages, while the additional \$372 goes for materials and supervision. The Federal Government pays for approximately \$192 of this overhead and the local sponsors contribute \$160. This means that approximately 38 percent of all funds expended under the W. P. A. program are spent for other purposes

than for the wages of persons on relief, and it should be recalled also that approximately 9 percent of the nonadministrative staff on all works projects are persons who are not on relief.

The average monthly rate of pay on work-relief projects under the W. P. A. varies from \$72.23 in New York City to \$23.93 in North Carolina. The average for the entire country is \$50.06. The differences in monthly wage rates supposedly is determined by differences in the cost of living, but the monthly-wage rate in Connecticut is \$64.33, in Rhode Island \$56.93, and in Massachusetts \$59.38. Mr. Hopkins at no place stated how the cost of living is determined. The average hourly rate of pay on work-relief projects is 41.6 cents. In New York City it was 65.2 cents, and for the rest of the country it was 38.4 cents.

W. P. A. FUNDS TO BE EXHAUSTED SOON

Of the somewhat over a billion dollars that has been allocated to the Works Progress Administration, approximately \$371,000,000 remained unobligated and approximately \$583,500,000 remained unexpended on March 31, 1936. The W. P. A. is spending approximately \$191,000,000 a month. If it is to continue in operation until July 1 approximately \$150,000,000 will have to be transferred from other funds to it, according to Mr. Hopkins—but it will probably be more than that. Mr. Hopkins asserts that all projects undertaken under the W. P. A. will be completed on that date, but he did admit that many projects, such as highways, would only be partially completed on that date.

When Mr. Hopkins was asked for information concerning politics in the administration of the Works Progress Administration he assumed the general attitude that he was not responsible for such circumstances, if they existed. He seemed to feel that he had done his part when he had written to the local administrators informing them that campaign contributions were not to be solicited from employees on work-relief projects. He did not seem to realize that inasmuch as all officials of the W. P. A. are Federal employees, and not State or local officials, he was directly responsible for their actions.

F. E. R. A. COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION

These hearings brought to light some evidence previously unobtainable relative to the administration of relief under the F. E. R. A. For the first time figures on administrative expenditures incurred by the States and the Federal Government for the administration of relief under the F. E. R. A. were made public. During the entire period of 1933 to 1935, 10.7 percent of all funds expended for relief went for administrative purposes. Administrative costs were lowest in the State of Vermont, where they only accounted for 5.4 percent of the expenditures. They were highest in South Carolina, where they were 18.3 percent. The figures for the following States may be of some interest: Georgia, 17.7 percent; Virginia, 17.5 percent; Kentucky, 16 percent; Maine, 6.1 percent; and Massachusetts, 5.8 percent.

The trend of relief as shown by the figures contained in the appendix to the hearings is of some interest. In July 1933 there were 3,908,068 relief cases. By January 1935 the number had increased to 5,273,472, and in June 1935 there were 4,530,852 relief cases. (It is interesting to compare these figures with the estimates of unemployment prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board. According to these figures there were 11,809,000 unemployed in July 1933; in January 1933 the figure was 10,340,000; and in June of the same year it was 9,092,000.)

The cost of relief per family increased tremendously during the period from the inception of the F. E. R. A. to the present time. The monthly payments per family in May 1933 were \$15.15, and in January 1935 the figure was \$30.45.

HOW MANY COULD BE CARRIED ON DIRECT RELIEF?

When Mr. Hopkins was asked how many families could be taken care of under direct relief for 1 year through the utilization of all funds available to the W. P. A., Mr. Hopkins estimated the number to be 3,226,800. In arriving at this estimate Mr. Hopkins stated that the average cost of relief

per family per month during the last fiscal year was \$33.66 (p. 177).

ALLOCATION OF F. E. R. A. FUNDS TO STATES

These hearings contain no additional data concerning the method of allocating funds to the States for the purpose of relief under the F. E. R. A. In fact the data contained in appendix F to these hearings, covering pages 375 to 418, does not give even as lucid an explanation of the matter as did Mr. Hopkins in his letter to the Senate printed in Senate Document 56, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

In the appendix to the present hearings it is stated on pages 396 and 397 that the following considerations determined the size of the relief grants that were given to the several States: First. The extent of the program currently operated by the States. This supposedly meant the relief program that a State was willing and desirous of administering. Second. The general administrative policy of the Federal Government toward relief; that is, whether the Federal Government believed it desirable to raise or lower the general standard of relief for the whole country. Third. The number of relief cases in each State. Fourth. The cost of relief per case in each State. Fifth. The nature of the relief program of the State; that is, whether the State was operating on the basis of direct relief only or on the basis of direct relief and work relief. Sixth. Seasonal factors; that is, relief costs are lower in warm weather than in cold. Seventh. Emergency situations, such as floods, earthquakes, strikes, and so forth. Eighth. Administrative considerations. In a few instances where the Governor or legislature of a State failed to make adequate funds available the F. E. R. A. temporarily withheld funds or reduced grants until the situation was remedied. Ninth. The total funds available for the Nation.

It should be noted that this statement does not indicate that the financial abilities of the several States were taken into consideration when relief funds were allocated. Relative to the determination of the financial abilities of the States, Mr. Hopkins made the following remarks:

Now, it is patently the case that we do not pay the same percentage in all States, for simple reason that the per-capita wealth in one community that may have a great deal of unemployment may be very low, while the per-capita wealth of another community with the same amount of unemployment may be twice as much.

Now, obviously, one community is more able to pay than the other. We have been unable to find any criterion by which you can determine accurately and scientifically what a community can or cannot afford to pay or whether they can afford to pay a higher percentage than they have been paying.

We have simply acted on the basis of the best advice and information we could get. If you will look at the figures of the money that was distributed, you will find that the most dollars were distributed to places where there was the greatest unemployment and heaviest relief program. The argument always centered around whether the percentage that goes to a State is too high and not whether the number of dollars is too great (p. 151).

Obviously, with such a long list of factors to be considered in the allocation of relief funds, and in the absence of any objective standard to determine the relative weight to be given each factor, no scientific basis seems to have been used for apportioning the funds among the States. The wide variations in Federal apportionments per relief family among the various States suggest the possibility that funds were given out arbitrarily according to the wishes of the administration.

Mr. Hopkins repeatedly said that more money is now being secured for relief purposes from States and local government than was being secured several years ago, but during the first quarter of 1933 the Federal Government paid 58.4 percent of the total cost of relief, and during the first quarter of 1935 it was paying 77.8 percent of the total cost of relief.

TESTIMONY CONFINED TO W. P. A.

Throughout the hearings on the requested relief appropriation the members of the House Committee on Appropriations were greatly hampered by the fact that Mr. Hopkins alone was called to give evidence. He repeatedly took the attitude that he was only to give evidence on the administration of the W. P. A. and F. E. R. A. rather than to give data concern-

ing the administration of the entire \$4,880,000,000 appropriation of 1935.

There were a number of occasions when members of the subcommittee requested information concerning the administration of the entire work-relief fund, but to the question of these members Mr. Hopkins gave answers only concerning the Works Progress Administration. For example, he was asked for information concerning radio broadcasts. To this question he answered that the Works Progress Administration had no funds for such purposes. He did not tell the members that funds had been allocated to the Office of Education for the purpose of developing a program of radio broadcasts in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps. It was also impossible to get from Mr. Hopkins data on the costs of work relief per man in agencies other than the Works Progress Administration.

The accompanying table compares the allocations from funds appropriated under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 with the relief case load in the several States for the month of June 1935—the latest obtainable complete figures.

It will be noted from the table that there are wide differences in the total amounts allotted to the various States per relief case in those States. Over \$3,600 was allotted to Wyoming per relief case while in Pennsylvania \$670 was allotted per relief case and in South Dakota \$548 per relief case.

The allocation of funds only for W. P. A. as contrasted with allocations for all agencies indicates similar striking differences. Allotment was made to Maryland of \$291 per relief case, \$132 in South Dakota, \$176 in Kentucky, while in New York \$479 was allotted per relief case.

Allocation of funds under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, compared with relief cases by States

State	Relief cases June 1935	Total funds all agencies	Total W. P. A. funds	Total funds per case	W. P. A. funds per case
Alabama	83,832	\$64,446,977	\$17,421,545	\$768.76	\$207.81
Arizona	20,387	37,921,823	5,198,424	1,860.10	254.99
Arkansas	74,160	59,820,101	14,366,301	806.64	193.72
California	241,327	209,228,356	77,061,694	1,115.62	319.32
Colorado	62,889	58,961,687	17,863,127	937.55	284.04
Connecticut	42,310	38,996,427	14,026,505	921.68	331.52
Delaware	4,149	7,043,767	1,645,972	1,697.70	396.72
District of Columbia	18,603	24,488,834	6,594,933	1,316.39	354.51
Florida	64,747	60,158,797	14,789,117	929.14	228.41
Georgia	77,003	68,423,966	19,116,876	888.59	248.26
Idaho	20,776	39,711,106	4,862,907	1,911.39	234.06
Illinois	303,936	241,365,688	85,387,356	794.13	280.94
Indiana	114,857	86,566,102	40,040,009	753.69	348.61
Iowa	49,929	46,958,400	12,968,713	940.50	259.74
Kansas	79,935	56,029,798	16,327,388	700.94	204.26
Kentucky	107,556	62,851,211	18,949,291	584.36	176.18
Louisiana	64,051	53,820,041	17,052,315	840.27	266.23
Maine	22,169	26,947,502	4,743,244	1,215.55	213.96
Maryland	38,320	53,447,970	11,179,104	1,394.78	291.73
Massachusetts	186,528	149,407,527	50,670,372	800.99	271.65
Michigan	168,785	135,751,398	45,070,145	804.29	267.03
Minnesota	104,125	95,099,363	29,677,101	913.32	285.01
Mississippi	59,169	48,107,380	11,227,113	813.05	189.75
Missouri	146,826	98,882,133	32,557,031	673.46	221.74
Montana	26,257	55,152,689	7,365,238	2,100.49	280.51
Nebraska	44,404	49,019,832	10,206,349	1,103.95	229.85
Nevada	3,030	12,103,165	1,393,762	3,994.44	459.99
New Hampshire	14,322	13,978,178	3,589,440	975.99	250.62
New Jersey	157,092	120,792,564	45,386,890	768.93	288.92
New Mexico	30,868	39,822,407	5,556,104	1,290.09	180.00
New York	541,138	548,965,954	259,734,795	1,014.47	479.98
North Carolina	70,759	57,946,689	12,174,890	818.93	172.06
North Dakota	39,944	31,639,395	5,282,211	792.09	132.24
Ohio	323,178	221,539,879	91,018,680	685.50	281.64
Oklahoma	118,526	77,516,000	26,285,339	654.00	221.77
Oregon	30,035	41,951,111	8,970,389	1,396.74	298.66
Pennsylvania	473,040	317,721,910	123,431,402	671.66	260.93
Rhode Island	18,661	16,768,548	6,658,024	898.59	356.79
South Carolina	59,573	46,413,065	9,240,333	779.10	155.11
South Dakota	59,378	32,591,453	6,019,019	548.88	101.37
Tennessee	77,208	68,939,257	15,102,526	892.90	195.61
Texas	198,316	165,310,825	34,997,881	838.62	176.48
Utah	26,798	28,910,252	6,961,844	1,078.82	259.79
Vermont	8,410	15,879,899	2,146,025	1,888.22	255.18
Virginia	52,182	57,370,734	11,695,941	1,099.44	224.14
Washington	67,394	85,206,559	17,193,235	1,264.30	255.12
West Virginia	88,642	63,957,213	21,476,388	721.52	242.28
Wisconsin	107,250	98,307,120	30,697,576	916.62	286.22
Wyoming	7,282	26,750,498	2,798,526	3,673.51	384.31
Continental United States	4,800,056	4,173,989,570	1,334,179,370	869.57	277.95

¹ Data on allotments from House of Representatives hearings on first deficiency appropriation bill, 1936.

² Data from F. E. R. A. monthly report for June 1935.

³ Includes some duplication of families or individuals who received relief under both the general relief and rural rehabilitation programs.

Assigned monthly wage rates of Works Progress Administration workers by States (excluding persons not assigned at the established monthly wage schedule) December 1935

(Average monthly wage rate by States)

United States	\$50.03
Alabama	28.95
Arizona	49.65
Arkansas	26.40
California	59.83
Colorado	51.75
Connecticut	64.33
Delaware	48.47
District of Columbia	47.33
Florida	27.63
Georgia	26.63
Idaho	44.25
Illinois	54.20
Indiana	51.95
Iowa	49.42
Kansas	38.13
Kentucky	25.60
Louisiana	37.92
Maine	48.76
Maryland	45.75
Massachusetts	59.38
Michigan	54.87
Minnesota	55.95
Mississippi	24.33
Missouri	44.10
Montana	46.92
Nebraska	42.00
Nevada	46.95
New Hampshire	49.83
New Jersey	56.05
New Mexico	44.98
New York City	72.23
New York (excluding New York City)	60.90
North Carolina	23.93
North Dakota	44.35
Ohio	55.45
Oklahoma	26.75
Oregon	54.50
Pennsylvania	59.97
Rhode Island	56.93
South Carolina	26.22
South Dakota	43.80
Tennessee	28.38
Texas	30.40
Utah	51.45
Vermont	44.20
Virginia	29.80
Washington	54.82
West Virginia	41.15
Wisconsin	56.33
Wyoming	46.06

Estimated cost of Works Progress Administration projects selected for operation by States, through Mar. 16, 1936

State	Total	Works Progress Administration funds	Sponsors' contributions	Percent of total cost contributed by sponsors
United States	\$1,368,057,734	\$1,113,271,212	\$254,786,522	18.6
Alabama	19,683,918	15,687,776	3,996,142	20.3
Arizona	5,771,483	4,352,860	1,418,623	24.6
Arkansas	15,076,209	12,161,166	3,815,043	25.3
California	85,137,622	68,041,733	17,095,889	20.1
Colorado	17,436,941	14,875,510	2,561,431	14.7
Connecticut	14,058,639	11,136,750	2,921,889	20.8
Delaware	1,360,316	1,136,544	223,772	16.5
District of Columbia	4,673,153	4,287,664	385,489	8.2
Florida	16,165,630	12,476,303	3,689,327	22.8
Georgia	26,537,625	15,840,011	10,697,614	40.3
Idaho	6,723,265	3,991,318	2,731,947	40.6
Illinois	82,160,762	69,928,044	12,232,718	14.9
Indiana	49,122,303	35,410,467	13,711,836	27.9
Iowa	11,407,847	9,229,220	2,178,627	19.1
Kansas	16,032,079	12,216,269	3,815,810	23.8
Kentucky	22,544,180	13,590,901	6,953,279	30.8
Louisiana	16,890,276	14,523,816	2,366,460	14.0
Maine	3,863,508	3,135,545	727,963	18.8
Maryland	10,068,852	8,452,551	1,616,301	16.1
Massachusetts	51,797,401	40,045,680	11,751,721	22.7
Michigan	42,977,812	36,344,331	6,633,481	15.4
Minnesota	26,307,722	23,218,322	3,089,400	11.7
Mississippi	10,576,469	8,706,454	1,869,985	17.7
Missouri	32,218,306	26,306,488	5,911,818	18.3
Montana	7,090,638	5,991,359	1,099,279	15.5
Nebraska	8,609,935	6,738,730	1,871,205	21.7
Nevada	1,539,808	1,177,183	362,625	23.6
New Hampshire	3,512,347	2,579,575	932,772	26.6
New Jersey	44,657,624	36,785,129	7,872,495	17.6
New Mexico	6,535,212	5,203,237	1,331,975	20.4
New York	248,043,259	217,201,632	30,841,627	12.4
North Carolina	10,887,215	8,648,890	2,238,325	20.6
North Dakota	4,198,935	3,413,975	784,960	18.7
Ohio	99,616,912	82,129,771	17,487,141	17.6
Oklahoma	27,104,106	22,743,015	4,361,091	16.1
Oregon	8,289,194	6,701,085	1,588,109	19.2

Estimated cost of Works Progress Administration projects selected for operation by States, through Mar. 16, 1936—Continued

State	Total	Works Progress Administration funds	Sponsors' contributions	Percent of total cost contributed by sponsors
Pennsylvania.....	\$132,899,672	\$114,521,621	\$18,378,051	13.8
Rhode Island.....	7,956,102	5,241,075	2,715,027	34.1
South Carolina.....	11,472,009	7,197,166	4,274,843	37.3
South Dakota.....	6,109,207	4,571,896	1,537,311	25.2
Tennessee.....	16,055,700	11,542,780	4,512,920	28.1
Texas.....	38,687,252	29,331,412	9,355,840	24.2
Utah.....	7,966,923	6,000,569	1,966,354	24.7
Vermont.....	2,451,043	1,677,245	773,798	31.6
Virginia.....	10,080,626	8,726,173	1,354,453	13.4
Washington.....	18,290,089	14,746,286	3,543,803	19.4
West Virginia.....	18,759,489	17,225,512	1,533,977	8.2
Wisconsin.....	34,068,639	23,980,666	10,087,973	29.6
Wyoming.....	3,683,420	2,099,177	1,584,243	43.0

Allocation of funds provided under Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935

State	Total all agencies	Total per capita	Total W. P. A.	W. P. A. per capita
Alabama.....	\$64,446,977	\$24.35	\$17,421,545	\$6.58
Arizona.....	37,921,823	87.06	5,198,424	11.93
Arkansas.....	59,820,101	32.26	14,366,301	7.75
California.....	269,228,356	47.42	77,061,694	13.57
Colorado.....	58,961,687	56.92	17,863,127	17.25
Connecticut.....	38,996,427	24.27	14,026,505	8.73
Delaware.....	7,043,767	29.55	1,645,972	6.90
District of Columbia.....	24,488,834	50.80	6,594,933	13.55
Florida.....	40,156,797	40.97	14,789,117	10.07
Georgia.....	68,423,966	23.53	19,116,876	6.57
Idaho.....	39,711,106	89.23	4,862,907	10.98
Illinois.....	241,365,688	31.63	85,887,356	11.19
Indiana.....	86,566,102	26.73	40,040,009	12.36
Iowa.....	46,958,400	19.00	12,968,713	5.25
Kansas.....	56,029,798	29.79	16,827,888	8.68
Kentucky.....	62,851,211	24.04	18,949,291	7.25
Louisiana.....	53,820,041	25.61	17,652,315	8.11
Maine.....	26,947,502	33.79	4,743,244	5.95
Maryland.....	53,447,970	32.76	11,179,104	6.85
Massachusetts.....	149,407,527	35.16	50,670,372	11.92
Michigan.....	135,751,398	28.03	45,070,145	9.31
Minnesota.....	95,099,363	37.09	29,677,101	11.57
Mississippi.....	48,107,380	23.94	11,227,113	5.59
Missouri.....	98,882,133	27.25	32,557,031	8.97
Montana.....	55,152,689	102.59	7,365,238	13.70
Nebraska.....	49,019,832	35.57	10,206,349	7.41
Nevada.....	12,103,165	132.92	1,393,762	15.31
New Hampshire.....	13,978,178	30.04	3,889,440	7.71
New Jersey.....	120,792,564	29.89	45,886,890	11.23
New Mexico.....	39,822,407	94.07	5,556,104	13.13
New York.....	548,965,954	43.61	259,734,795	20.63
North Carolina.....	57,946,689	18.28	12,174,890	3.84
North Dakota.....	31,639,395	46.47	5,282,211	7.76
Ohio.....	221,539,879	33.33	91,018,680	13.69
Oklahoma.....	77,516,000	32.35	26,285,339	10.97
Oregon.....	41,951,111	43.98	8,970,369	9.41
Pennsylvania.....	317,721,910	32.99	123,431,402	12.82
Rhode Island.....	16,768,548	24.39	6,658,024	9.68
South Carolina.....	46,413,085	26.69	9,240,333	5.31
South Dakota.....	32,591,453	47.04	6,019,019	8.69
Tennessee.....	68,999,257	26.35	15,102,526	5.77
Texas.....	166,310,825	28.55	34,997,881	6.01
Utah.....	28,910,252	56.93	6,961,844	13.71
Vermont.....	15,879,899	44.16	2,140,025	5.97
Virginia.....	57,370,734	23.69	11,695,941	4.83
Washington.....	85,206,559	54.50	17,193,235	11.00
West Virginia.....	63,957,213	36.99	21,476,388	12.42
Wisconsin.....	98,307,120	33.45	30,697,576	10.44
Wyoming.....	26,750,498	118.59	2,798,526	12.41
Administrative expense in Washington, D. C.	37,332,795	-----	4,117,415	-----
Not allocated to specific States	233,778,758	-----	25,630,116	-----
Continental United States.....	4,445,101,123	36.21	1,363,926,901	11.11
Alaska.....	3,621,137	61.09	-----	-----
Hawaii.....	9,062,614	24.60	-----	-----
Panama Canal Zone.....	700,000	17.74	-----	-----
Puerto Rico.....	48,738,159	31.57	-----	-----
Virgin Islands.....	1,189,252	54.03	-----	-----
Territories and possessions.....	63,311,162	31.14	-----	-----
Grand total.....	4,508,412,285	36.12	1,363,926,901	10.93

Data from House of Representatives hearings on first deficiency appropriation bill, 1936.

EULOGY TO THE MOTHERS OF AMERICA

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein my personal eulogy to the mothers of America, National Mother's Day being May 10 next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, May 10, will be the Mother's Day, and, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my personal eulogy to the mothers of America:

Perhaps the most important and widest-reaching of all influences which constantly bear upon us in this world are those which arise from the nature and relationships of our home. A combination of instincts and circumstances, some of which we hold in common with the lower animals and some of which are higher and quite peculiar to ourselves, make a home essential to our well-being and happiness. And it is home that has given unto us the goddess of love on earth, "Our Mothers." Home is the central spot on earth about which lodge three-fourths of the pleasant or sorrowful memories of life. The tendrils of the youthful heart wrap themselves around it so tightly that even the shock of years or the deadening strain of distance cannot pull them away. And there was never a home but what was spun from the gorgeous fabric of motherhood. There is no other such charmed word in the English language as that little word "mother." There is no other song that can thrill the soul with such magnetic power and can so surely melt the stony heart to tears as that song of life which has an unwritten melody in the heartstrings of us all—that song which mother sang in the crooning lisp to a babe upon her knee. God, in all His infinite majesty, sought out a monument on earth never to be destroyed by selfishness; He patterned his structure after His own beauty reflected in the garden of roses; He painted it with the iridescent colors of the mirrored lake at sunset overcome with its own serenity and reflecting the diadems of heavenly stars as they glitter their jealous sparkle into its bosom of softness.

He touches its finished texture with the sweetness of Mary Magdalene, and then to set it apart as the earthly masterpiece of things humanly divine, he added patience, kindness, and love, and no man shall ever put asunder amid humanity's afflicted masses, this monument of God erected on earth in the form of "Mother." And what is this motherly patience of which I speak? It is the angels who sit by man, holding out a full bowl of life's rich contentment. And what is this motherly kindness? It is the pleasant words, the gentle smile, the loving forethought which mothers never fail to lavish upon us and which overcomes despair to make life a dream of happiness. And motherly love—that something which knows no depth, no faltering, no conquering; that tenderness of care born of the heavens above; that pureness of care that rides the juggernauts on life's tempestuous sea as though on the calm of even'tide—in short, that which only a mother can give.

My mother, your mother, our mothers—God bless them all—sweet mother, kind mother, whose unjeweled hand smoothed the sweetness of baby fingers; whose sweet, tender voice was alike unto the echo of evening zephyrs hallowing the environment of home; with eyes in whose clear depths the love-light shone; soft, brown hair just threaded with silver, lying smoothly upon her cheek; dear old wrinkled hands, worn with toil, gently guiding our tottering steps in sickness; even reaching out in yearning tenderness to when her sweet spirit was baptized in the early spray of the river of hope. Ah, perhaps you who are listening to me, cherish with me the memory of the mother who has gone on to her great reward—a memory that floats to us now like the beautiful perfume from the flowered dells of our Southland. The music of other voices may be lost, but the entrancing memory of hers echoes to our soul forever.

Hundreds of stars in the silent sky,
 Hundreds of shells on the shore together,
 Hundreds of birds that go singing by,
 Hundreds of bees in sunny weather,
 Hundreds of dewdrops to greet the dawn,
 Hundreds of lambs in the purple clover,
 Hundreds of butterflies on the lawn,
 But only one mother the wide world over.

And it seems so sad that human frailty causes such a serious neglect of appreciation of the living mother. I am wondering if you whose mothers are either by your side or elsewhere are fully cognizant of the tide of motherhood that is ebbing slowly but surely away—if you have considered the truth as it is, that she is the living friend who knows no end to save and sooth your pain; that bouquets and love baskets will best meet your hopes and wishes now while she might inhale the sweetness of their odor and bathe in the parental joy of your thoughtfulness? Give her that soft and caressing kiss that she so yearns for. Feed her upon the daily thoughtfulness that she so richly deserves but which most of us so negligently and carelessly fail to give her. Give her a moment of your time to listen to the sweet reminiscences of your early childhood which she holds so dear to her heart. Put aside the selfish ideas that only one day in the year is Mother's Day, because I tell you religiously that when the soft steps of her sacred feet shall have faded from earth and the shadows of death shall have enveloped her precious earthly soul, there will never be a day in your life but what will be filled with stern grief over the loss of your mother, because, when all is said and done and she has gone on to the Father of us all, you will find that—

You've lived to learn that friends grow weak
When trouble marks you for its own—
The ones you love oft turn aside
And leave the fight to you alone.

And, in the words of another:

When mother has gone, your supplications will be offered fourfold, only to find them too late.

I've stood on many scenes of strife, I've stood where care and pain assailed; and tho friends often turned away, yet, mother's hand has never failed.

As in childhood far removed, she smoothed my brow and dried each tear, still in young manhood's troubled hour with loving words she hovered near. Oh, fickle love and friendship false; Oh, glittering dreams and hopes bewailed, you weakened in life's darkest hour, but mother's love has never failed. Whatever God shall choose to do with this frail tenement of clay; whatever use he finds for it along life's dark and dreary way, that much shall be a monument to tell mankind, wh'er assailed, a mother's love, a mother's prayers, a mother's hand has never failed.

And how mortally true are these words—how many times when the tempter lures us on has the memory of that sacred hour, that mother's words, her prayers, saved us from plunging into the deep abyss of sin. Years have filled great drifts between her and us, but they may not take from our sight the glory of pure, unselfish love. And as I have said before, other faces may fade and be forgotten, but her's shall shine on until the light from heaven's portals will glorify our own. When the fitful pauses of busy feet wander back to the old homestead and cross the well-worn threshold, stand once more in the low, quaint room, so hallowed by her presence, how the feeling of childish innocence and dependence comes over us and we kneel down in the molten sunshine streaming in at the window covered by the morning glory, just where long years ago we knelt down by our mother's knee lisping:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. BUCHANAN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2591), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all points of order against the bill be considered as waived.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask a question. Just exactly what does the gentleman have in mind in asking that all points of order be waived?

Does the request apply also to any amendment that may be offered to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It would not apply to any germane amendment. The request simply waives all points of order against any provision in the bill and the bill is to be considered under the general rules for the conduct of business in the House.

Mr. SNELL. The request applies to nothing further than what is contained in the bill at the present time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is an appropriation bill and the request is very unusual. It would be a bad precedent to establish, and I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I will reserve the objection, but unless some good reason is given I shall object. A precedent is being set with respect to an appropriation bill which would make it impossible to raise a point of order if there was anything in the bill that would be subject to a point of order, and in this connection let me call attention to the fact that the bill has just been made available to the Members and there are over 2,000 pages of hearings which no one has had an opportunity to read and I do not think we should waive all points of order against something that no one has any information about except the members of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that we are trying to expedite the consideration of the bill as much as possible consonant with its intelligent consideration. We propose to be liberal in debate and to sit until midnight tomorrow night if necessary.

Of course, objection to waiving points of order on the bill will cause a rule to be brought in and consume that much more time. To refuse to waive them will not accomplish any good purpose, but will simply cause that much more trouble.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman mind stating the irrelevant matter in the bill that you will have to sustain by a rule?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to the gentleman some of them. I do not know that I can state all of them, but I may say that the principal one is with respect to relief. There is no law authorizing an appropriation for relief and this provision would be subject to a point of order. This item amounts to \$1,425,000,000.

Then, there is an item of \$65,000,000 for public buildings throughout the United States and every congressional district will probably get one of them. There is no authorization of law for that and on a point of order this item would go out of the bill.

The Civilian Conservation Corps paragraph is subject to a point of order and there is a number of smaller things in the bill not so important. If points of order were made and sustained under the rule there would be no use in reporting the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. As I understand it, the granting of the gentleman's request will have no effect whatever on amendments which may be offered outside of the provisions in the bill. The regular rules of the House will still prevail and amendments that are not in the bill will have to be germane if points of order are raised against them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. That was stated in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. If that is all there is to it, I shall withdraw my objection, but I do want it understood that in the future I shall object to any waiving of points of order, especially on bills of which the House has no information. The majority has the votes and the power; any objection on my part could accomplish nothing but would take up time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the total amount to be appropriated in this bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Less than \$25,000,000 of actual deficiency.

Mr. RICH. We have just now received the hearings and bill under discussion, which I hold in my hand. This is the first opportunity Members of the House have had to know anything about this bill. It seems to me the chairman of this committee and the membership of the House should know something about the bill at least a day before they bring up appropriation bills and ask the membership to pass upon them, especially one appropriating over \$2,000,000,000.

I do not think it is within rhyme or good reason or good sense to do things the way we are doing them. Then the gentleman asks us in 2 days to consider and pass a bill appropriating more than \$2,000,000,000. I do not think we ought to do these things in this way. The Members of this House should have such a bill at least 1 week previous to its consideration, in order to study its contents; not a bill appropriating \$2,000,000,000 given us 10 minutes before its consideration on the floor. The largest business in the world, the United States Government, conducting itself in very poor business procedure. Why, Mr. Speaker, do we do it?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I simply want to say that it is not conceivable to me that Members would object to relief appropriations or public works mentioned here. If that is the only two points that are waived, it is inconceivable to me that the waiver is necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes. And pending that, I would like to fix the time for general debate.

Mr. TABER. I suggest 7 hours' general debate confined to the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 7 hours, confined to the bill, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill. Pending that he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 7 hours, to be confined to the bill, and to be controlled equally by himself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Is there objection?

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask the gentleman from Texas whether if there is to be a roll call on the bill the vote may take place on Monday next.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have no authority to do that now, but I have no objection to such an arrangement.

Mr. PARSONS. Several Members are away who will be back on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, if we happen to reach a final vote on this bill Friday night and the previous question can be ordered on the bill, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection to its going over until Monday to take the vote.

Mr. TABER. Or a final vote on a motion to recommit, provided the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12624, the deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. McCORMACK in the chair.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who will relieve me somewhat because of my physical condition.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the bill (H. R. 12624) now being presented to the Committee of the Whole, is very comprehensive. It covers a great many subjects and appropriates a lot of money. However, in the years that I have served on the Committee on Appropriations I have never known a bill to receive more careful deliberation, consideration, and scrutiny than the one we bring to you today. In spite of the fact that our beloved and distinguished chairman has not felt well, he has labored long and hard in the preparation of this bill, oftentimes over the protest of his colleagues, and he would probably be down here now explaining the bill to you had it not been for some of us insisting that he keep his seat. Also, the minority of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON], have attended the sessions of the subcommittee and have interrogated the witnesses. They have scrutinized the requests for appropriations in connection with this bill. We bring you comprehensive and voluminous hearings, 2,000 printed pages, which I believe will show that the subjects have been gone into very carefully. I say this merely as a prelude to this proposition, that we ask you to give consideration to the fact that your committee, minority as well as majority, brings you the result of their deliberations and consideration.

Very likely during the course of the bill there will be differences of opinion about certain items in the bill, but the issues have been narrowed. The facts are here, and the evidence is here, and you gentlemen will be the arbiters.

I do not want to consume a lot of time. It would be very easy to discuss this bill all afternoon. It has broad ramifications and covers many subjects. I shall hit the high spots, what I think to be the major items, and then endeavor as best I can to answer any questions that may be propounded.

The total Budget estimates sent to us for this bill amounted to \$2,388,088,980.91. We bring you a bill totaling \$2,364,229,712.53, after having deducted \$23,859,268.38 from the estimates. Perhaps that does not seem to be a very great reduction in so large a total, but when you consider the fact that approximately a billion and a half dollars in one lump sum is the item for relief, that something like another half billion dollars goes for the social-security program, and over three hundred million for the C. C. C., I feel that we have made substantial reductions in the bill at points where it could and should be reduced. I call attention to the further fact that although this is called a "deficiency" appropriation bill, yet the real "deficiencies" carried in the bill are something like 1 percent of the whole amount, or less than \$25,000,000, the remaining items being for the Tennessee Valley Authority, public buildings, and for regular

Federal activities. The following table gives a bird's-eye view of the estimates and appropriations:

Purpose	Budget estimates	Amounts recommended	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with Budget estimates
Works Progress Administration (1937).....	\$1,500,000,000.00	\$1,425,000,000.00	-\$75,000,000.00
Emergency Conservation Work (1937).....	246,000,000.00	308,000,000.00	+62,000,000.00
Social Security: Social Security Board (1937).....	195,800,000.00	187,800,000.00	-8,000,000.00
Treasury Department (1937).....	270,831,860.00	270,831,860.00	-----
Public Buildings, Treasury Department: Outside the District of Columbia (1937).....	53,350,000.00	63,350,000.00	+10,000,000.00
Within the District of Columbia (1937).....	7,700,000.00	2,200,000.00	-5,500,000.00
Tennessee Valley Authority (1937).....	43,000,000.00	39,900,000.00	-3,100,000.00
Post Office Department (40-hour week and increased business) (1936).....	40,581,250.00	40,506,250.00	-75,000.00
All other purposes (supplemental amounts for 1936 and 1937 and deficiencies for 1936 and prior years).....	30,825,870.91	26,641,602.53	-4,184,268.38
Total.....	2,388,088,980.91	2,364,229,712.53	-23,859,268.38

I shall talk now for a few minutes about the Works Progress Administration, because that is the largest item in the bill, and I have an idea it will be one of the items which will engage your interest during the consideration of the bill. The President's request for this appropriation was for a billion and a half. The committee brings it to you \$1,425,000,000, and the reduction of \$75,000,000 was occasioned in this wise: It will be recalled that there was a great deal of interest manifested when it was announced that a reduction in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps would be made about the 1st of April, and that many Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, were interested in seeing that part of the recovery program continue as long as possible. After conferences it was agreed that the President should allocate to the C. C. C. program a certain sum of money which would carry them along during the remainder of this fiscal year, and that there would be supplied in this bill an additional \$62,000,000 to bring the amount up from \$246,000,000 to \$308,000,000, which would continue the more than 2,000 camps, with 350,000 enrollees, during 9 months of the next fiscal year. So we have carried here the additional \$62,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps for the 9-month period, which will give an average of 2,066 camps during that period, with an enrollment of 350,000.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does that mean the 9 months immediately succeeding June 30 next?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is the first 9 months of the next fiscal year.

Mr. MAY. And that begins June 30?

Mr. WOODRUM. That begins July 1. It runs from then to March 31, 1937.

Now, let me say this about the camps. We are all interested in the camps, but bear in mind that the entitlement to enrollment in the camps is that the enrollees be taken from the relief rolls, and you will find in your districts now that the camps are having a great deal of trouble keeping up their enrollments. So we feel that under this appropriation the camp work will be carried on as far as it is possible to carry it out for enrollees, so long as we keep strict entitlement to enrollment, which I think every Member approves.

So much for \$62,000,000 of that \$75,000,000 reduction. The Budget estimates provided for \$50,000,000 for the regular public-works program under the Procurement Division. That is to say, these types of public buildings provided for which are built upon the recommendation of the Secretary

of the Treasury and the Postmaster General. You will find in the hearings two lists of projects. One list totals about \$59,000,000 and the other about \$58,000,000. Under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, acting jointly, have a right to select from these combined lists public-building projects in the United States, to the amount carried in the bill. I say the Budget estimate called for \$50,000,000. We believe it would take at least \$60,000,000 to carry forward that program—that is, the regular building program—and provide as near as possible one building project for each congressional district, bearing in mind always, of course, that the congressional district would have a qualified building project that was logical and needed and appropriate. So we put \$10,000,000 on to that \$50,000,000, raising that to \$60,000,000 for that building program, and we took that \$10,000,000 from the \$1,500,000,000 relief fund.

That brings us to the \$1,425,000,000 for relief. Statistics vary as to how many people are unemployed. Under this program it is estimated that during the next fiscal year the Works Progress Administration will be able to keep an average of approximately 2,000,000 at work. Let me direct your attention to this: We should do well to bear this fundamental fact in mind as we consider this bill, or as we consider any possible question of ear-marking funds: I believe we all agree that the Federal Government should withdraw from the field of relief as quickly as possible, and that it should be left to communities and localities just as speedily as they are able financially to take care of the load. There is no difference of opinion about that. The President of the United States is just as heartily in favor of that as any Member of the House or any citizen of the Nation. Therefore, the relief funds asked in this bill are to take care of one particular group, the destitute unemployed. When I tell you that the entitlement to get jobs under W. P. A. is that the person shall be upon relief rolls, you will answer that we penalize a group of citizens who have not applied for relief but who need jobs just as much as somebody else. That is true. That may be said in testimony to the patriotism and courage of that person who has not applied for relief, but bear in mind that it is the duty of a citizen not to apply for relief unless he has to do it.

While it is true that there may be people upon the relief rolls less deserving than some one who has not applied for relief, the fact remains that the man who is not on relief has been able to swim so far. The only yardstick, the only measurement you could possibly have as to the people who need it most—and that is what we are trying to find, the group who must have it—and unless they do have relief of some sort they are going actually to suffer, is the relief rolls that have been established by the communities, the cities, and the counties.

Let me say to you that when some constituent tells you he does not approve of the Federal program for relief because he knows Bill Jones down in some part of your district is on relief and he has no business to be there, you may answer by saying, "If that is true, it is not my fault. It is the fault of that community, because they put him there." The Federal Government so far has not undertaken in any sense to prescribe the entitlements for this relief. The people who are on relief are put there by the authorities, the associations, and organizations of the particular communities wherein they reside. Why? Because logically they are the ones, the friends, neighbors, and fellow citizens, are the ones who are best able to determine who is deserving of relief. So there is no way you can work out a program or a formula to find these people who just must have assistance, unless you leave it to the local authorities. Even then you will find people sometimes on the outside more deserving than those who are on relief.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Right on the subject which the gentleman is discussing is a matter of vital importance in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps organization. It has been

known for some months that some of the camps were about to be retired for the reason that they were not able to fill their quotas. I believe, and I think each community would appreciate it, if it was made possible for them to employ in the camps what are known as "locals." That is, men who are idle without employment and not on the relief rolls, just the class the gentleman has been discussing, but who are not within the age limit. In that way you keep them from ultimately going on the relief rolls.

Mr. WOODRUM. Answering my friend, I want to say that the Federal Government wants to close the camps just as soon as it can be done; as soon as the need for them ceases to exist they should be closed. We could, of course, devise some formula to keep them open. We could relax the rules, but I want to say to my distinguished friend from Kentucky that once you relax the rules that a person has to be on relief to get in a camp, then your trouble begins, for any citizen in the gentleman's district who has an incorrigible boy he would like to get placed in some job for the summer will come to the gentleman and ask him to get him in. The gentleman will reply that it cannot be done, but his constituent will point to the fact that John Smith's boy got in, and he was not in need of it. Then the gentleman will come back at him with the statement that "it will only take a certain number of boys to bring up their enrollment to capacity, and we cannot get your boy in."

I may say to my friend that this situation has been given very careful thought. Neither the E. C. W. nor the President thinks this rule ought to be relaxed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman made the statement that local authorities were responsible for the type of people on relief. Does the gentleman mean by "local authorities" these social workers sent in by this relief administrator? Are they the "local people" who determine who shall go on the relief rolls?

Mr. WOODRUM. Nobody dictates to anybody who shall be put on relief, I may say to my friend from Idaho. He knows the situation—that in each community there is a committee of the welfare society oftentimes or the mayor's committee, whoever it is, a local committee passes on qualifications for admission to these relief rolls. Oftentimes they do take on social workers, who go in and assist them; but, after all, it is the local people of the community who determine it; the Federal Government does not do it. We have never done that. If there is a single person on a single relief roll who should not be there he is there because his friends and neighbors have countenanced the fact that he is there; it is not the fault of the Federal Government.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. What would be the status of a person who has been dropped from relief because of shortage of funds? What would be his status under the present law and under this bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is the very question, I may say to the gentleman from Oregon, that I asked Mr. Hopkins, during the hearings, and he will find in the hearings that very question brought up.

The gentleman will recall that the relief rolls were frozen about November of 1935. Undoubtedly cases of the character the gentleman suggests have arisen since then, cases where very deserving people are in urgent need. Mr. Hopkins stated to our committee that if these additional funds are appropriated it is the intention of his administration to make a careful study of that, and, in some measure, relax that rule so as to add to the rolls cases which have arisen since that arbitrary date on which the present relief rolls were frozen. I believe the situation will be reached, and that these very deserving cases will be cared for.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I notice in this bill there are additions for salary for the Department of Agriculture, \$200,000; the Bureau of the Census, \$200,000; for salaries and expenses,

buildings and grounds, District of Columbia, \$2,041,090; and increases for various other departments. Despite the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that Budget estimates were one thing, but what Congress appropriates is another, I wonder if the gentleman's committee has gone to the bottom of things to know whether these requests from the departments are absolutely necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman, answering generally, because his question is general, that the committee has gone into each departmental item carefully, as he will find from the hearings. In one department here the administrative expenses are reduced \$8,000,000, or 20 percent, for the next fiscal year. This should gladden the heart of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I have the most profound respect for my friend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], gentlemen from both sides of the aisle, who wield much power in the Committee on Appropriations, because I know they stand for economy; but, even so, these departments make such extravagant demands that I sometimes wonder whether we ought to give them anything more this year, whether we ought not make them get down to real bare-bone economy in the operation of their departments.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. I wonder whether when the Relief Administrator was before the committee, the committee ascertained what would happen to these people who are now on relief, and by reason of the forced reduction in relief rolls occasioned by the scarcity of funds, whether or not those people who were taken off of relief by reason of that fact would be prejudiced when they attempted to return to the relief rolls when more funds are made available.

Mr. WOODRUM. I understand what the gentleman has reference to, but I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that the relief rolls are being restricted and contracted in every county and in every State and in every municipality. With the approval of the Federal Government, the relief rolls are being carefully scrutinized and are being purged as fast as possible of those not needing relief, not only for the purpose of getting people off the relief rolls but in order to offer an additional inducement and incentive to private industry to take up the unemployed load. In other words, we are getting out of it just as fast as we can.

The specific question was whether a person taken off the relief roll may be prejudiced in coming back. I gave the answer to that question a few moments ago to another gentleman that the Relief Administration is trying to revise and revamp its rules with reference to the relief rolls in order to take in this group of people in the most equitable manner possible.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. On page 9 there appears an item of \$400,000 for the Federal Communications Commission. May I ask the gentleman if any part of that \$400,000 will be used to pay more than \$3,600 a year to an attorney for the Commission, the \$3,600 a year being the maximum amount paid attorneys for investigation committees at this time?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is asking whether any part of the \$400,000 appropriated for the A. T. & T. investigation will be used to pay attorneys more than \$3,600 a year?

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; I imagine it will be used for such purpose. They have a list of attorneys who are receiving more than \$3,600 a year; and, of course, this \$400,000 will be used to take care of the pay roll. I am not debating whether that investigation should go on or should have been started in the first place, because we have started it, and it is going on. The Communications Commission have their attorneys sitting across the table from the best lawyers in the United States, the highest priced counsel of the country, and the gentleman from Illinois knows we cannot get lawyers to

represent the Government at \$3,600 a year who would have the ability, experience, training, and background to cope with these high-priced gentlemen.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman will remember that the House decidedly defeated a bill that was brought in here sometime ago which would have appropriated \$10,000 to pay an attorney for about 6 months' work.

Mr. WOODRUM. That had to do with an attorney for a special investigating committee of the Senate, and I do not think the situation is comparable to this at all.

Mr. PARSONS. This is to be used for the same purpose as provided in that bill which was defeated?

Mr. WOODRUM. No. This is an investigation of great magnitude by an executive organization, as the gentleman knows, and I may say it is showing some signs of accomplishing a great deal.

Mr. PARSONS. In order to get this thing straight, the \$400,000 then is not to be used for the purpose of furnishing money or funds to cover the proposition involved in the bill that was brought in here a few weeks ago?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman has made some remarks concerning relief rolls. I have received complaints, and I think every Congressman has, from parties who claim they have been removed from the relief rolls or have not been placed upon the relief rolls and requesting my assistance. As I understand it, the matter of determining who goes on or who goes off the relief rolls is not determined by a Federal agency. That is done by either a State agency or a local agency and the Federal Government has nothing to do with that matter. In other words, we simply contribute to the various States our pro-rata part of the funds as we do in connection with funds used for highway purposes, and then the State authorities determine the matter from then on.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Referring to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, I merely wanted to say that the limitation of expenditure of \$3,600 per annum to employees of investigating committees applies only to the contingent fund of the two Houses and not to the agencies of the Government generally.

Mr. STUBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STUBBS. May I make an observation with reference to the C. C. C. camps and the young men in my district? Seven young men came to my office and I took them down to see if I could get them placed. Because their parents were not on the relief rolls they were not permitted to get these jobs, even though some of them were the sons of widows. My objection is the rules and regulations that are placed upon these young men make it impossible for them to secure the jobs when the jobs are there, and my objection further goes to the administrative department that makes such rules and regulations. I think this Congress should take some notice of that very thing.

Mr. WOODRUM. May I say in answer to the gentleman that I believe he has not entirely taken into consideration the fundamental purpose of the Civilian Conservation Corps? It is not to provide jobs for people; it is not to provide jobs for estimable young men, but has one particular purpose, and that is where a family is on relief and it has a young man within the age limit, instead of giving the family cash, it permits the boy to go to work and have a useful employment and \$25 a month of the funds to go to his family. Every Congressman here has had the experience that my friend has just related. There are fine young men in the community who have gotten out of school, or who have not anything to do. Time is hanging heavily on their hands, and in many cases, perhaps, the family needs

the added revenue of a few dollars a month, but the family is not on relief. Somebody in the family is working, and they have been able to keep away from relief. Under those circumstances the boy cannot get into a Civilian Conservation camp. Now, that is the rigid, strict rule that the President inaugurated when he set up these camps. It is that fact that has kept the C. C. C. clean and above any scandal which we might have had if we had opened the door wide so that boys could have been jammed into the camps by some Congressmen picking them out and putting them in there.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Did the gentleman's committee give any consideration to the need for a direct relief appropriation to care for those who are on relief but who could not get work because the work funds are not sufficient and who are in just as great need of relief as those who did get work?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman refers to the billion and a half. The billion and a half is to give work to the destitute unemployed as far as we can take care of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. But it will not.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; it will not; but I want to say to the gentleman that some reference has been made to earmarking this fund. If there is any criticism of the one and a half billion, it is that it is not enough. We hope it is enough, and we are going to try to make it do, because we are trying to get out of the business. We are trying to close up shop as soon as we can and not cause reputable and honest American citizens to suffer too much. We are trying to pull away from it as fast as this can be done. The billion and a half will not give jobs to all the destitute who are now on relief, but it will go as far as it can—and bear in mind that every dollar you take away from this fund and put into something else, you are keeping some man from getting a job who does need it and needs it worse than the other fellow.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. For instance, in my district, there are at least three or four thousand on relief rolls who are qualified in every way and cannot get work because the funds are not sufficient. If we cut off direct relief, they are outside the pale of all forms of public relief.

Mr. WOODRUM. If this billion and a half does not reach them, then I will say to my friend from Colorado that the State government and the municipalities will have to assume the burden.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. What developed in the hearings as to the plan of the Works Progress Administration with respect to projects that cannot be completed by June 30 next? Do they plan to carry on and finish these projects?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman means June 30 of this year?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. The W. P. A. has just about enough money to run until the end of this fiscal year, and, of course, we are hopeful this appropriation will pass and permit them to go ahead. They figure they will spend this money in the next fiscal year.

Mr. RAMSPECK. But the question I have in mind is whether or not they will continue with projects that are uncompleted or whether such projects will have to be resubmitted and acted upon again.

Mr. WOODRUM. My understanding is they will continue with uncompleted projects as long as the relief load in such community requires them to keep it up. Of course, these projects are conducted on a cooperative basis with the local communities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia 10 minutes more.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a brief question in that connection?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. This appropriation will also enable the directors in the various districts to embark upon new projects that have already been approved?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; certainly.

Mr. PARSONS. Where the relief load in the community is sufficient to furnish the labor.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we could discuss with profit and clearer understanding for quite a little longer period this one particular matter, but I want to make this statement to my colleagues. I commend to your consideration the hearings before our committee on the Works Progress Administration or the relief item. I ask you to look at the record, and in this connection I want to make a confession. I want to say to you that, like a good many citizens and like a great many Members of the House, I went into this hearing as a member of the committee very skeptical of the program as it was being conducted by the Works Progress Administration; but I believe I voice the sentiments of the members of the committee, or certainly most of them, when I say that that Administration came before our committee with a clear, frank, and open disclosure of its activities, gave all the information requested without evasion or any effort to conceal anything and frankly admitted shortcomings and failures and frailties that may have beset their activities, and, as one member of the committee, when the hearings were concluded I came to the conclusion that the Works Progress Administration was doing the very best job it could in a very bad situation for anyone to handle under any circumstances. I ask you to read the hearings. There is the record.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had an hour to discuss with you the boondoggling propositions in the W. P. A. There are about 100 or 150 projects in the W. P. A. that have been singled out by the critics of the program in newspapers and by speeches and held up to ridicule. Of course, many of them seem utterly ridiculous and indefensible. Some of them, no doubt, are indefensible. There are between 100 and 150 of such projects. They affect probably 2,000 people out of nearly 3,000,000 people employed. If all of them were bad, if all of them were indefensible, and if each one of them had been thrown overboard and not undertaken, they would constitute one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the program, or one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the 170,000 projects carried on by the Works Progress Administration.

When you look at the matter in this light, it is so small and so infinitesimal that it is not worthy of consideration. When you look at the larger proposition and consider the fact that this program has actually put to work between two and three million people, who needed employment, you will see that it has met the load that had to be carried, and I say to you that I feel it has done a good job on the whole.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. CARPENTER. I realize there have been a good many criticisms and various aspersions cast upon the Relief Administration and upon Mr. Hopkins, and I regret that there have been a great many on this side of the House, and by certain members of the Democratic Party, but I wish to say that I believe Mr. Hopkins has had the hardest job of any one in the United States, not excluding even the President of the United States, and that all in all he has done a mighty good job. Most of these boondoggling projects have been advocated and promoted by the local communities and they are the ones that should bear the blame if any blame or criticism is due on account of them.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am glad the gentleman made that statement. Nearly all of these projects were sponsored by and paid in part by local residents.

Mr. CURLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. CURLEY. I want to call attention to the fact that the word "boondoggling" was coined originally in an investigation by the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York in 1935. It was in connection with rhythmic dancing under the administration of the city of New York.

Mr. WOODRUM. I thank the gentleman for the contribution.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman says only one-seventeenth of 1 percent is a very small matter. I am reading from the hearings:

Mr. THURSTON. The Reedsville project was definitely turned down by Congress, but funds were allocated to that project in the face of that action by Congress.

Mr. WOODRUM. That was a relatively small proposition.

Was there no policy involved there?

Mr. WOODRUM. I have said that mistakes have been made, but the gentleman from Massachusetts does not understand the situation. The gentleman is one of the group that wants 100-percent perfection.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are "too damned dumb."

Mr. WOODRUM. I would not put it that way.

Mr. GIFFORD. The man that the gentleman is defending did.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am not defending anybody. If the gentleman will read the hearings—

Mr. GIFFORD. I have just received the hearings.

Mr. WOODRUM. Well, read them tonight. Harry Hopkins was put on the stand and grilled by both minority and majority members, and asked for statement after statement.

Mr. GIFFORD. And made a statement one day and changed it the next.

Mr. WOODRUM. Nothing of the kind. There is no justification for a statement of that kind.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am glad the gentleman denies it if it is not true.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is not true. I have had an opportunity of hearing the witness and the gentleman has not. There was not a question by which Harry Hopkins was embarrassed at any time or where he refused to give a fair, honest, and definite answer. I do not say that you have to approve everything he does. The gentleman from Massachusetts belongs to that class that requires 100-percent perfection. According to his philosophy, if one-seventeenth of 1 percent is wrong, then the whole thing should be condemned.

The theory of those who criticize seems to be, if you make a mistake on a few boondoggling projects, all the rest is wrong. We, of the administration, admit that we are human and that we as human beings are liable to err. We do claim that we are trying to administer honestly and courageously and effectively.

But let us pass on. Another large item in this bill is for the Social Security Act, which appears for a full fiscal year for the first time. The Budget estimates for the Social Security Board amounted to \$195,800,000 for the next fiscal year. That sounds like a large amount of money. It is a lot of money. Of that total \$157,000,000 is for grants to States. Twenty-three million dollars of the \$195,000,000 is for administrative expenses. The committee cut that to \$18,400,000. Fifteen million eight hundred thousand dollars was the Budget estimate for securing the initial wage-record data of the beneficiaries of old-age benefits, which, of course, is the first step in that program, a step that almost staggers the imagination in its magnitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take this time. It is as hard on me as it is on the Members here, but I think this explanation should be made. This

list, it is estimated, will comprise 26,000,000 people. It is a gigantic undertaking. Our committee, without any partisanship, looked into the matter as carefully as we could and we made a 20-percent reduction in the administrative expenses. That is a substantial cut. And I say with deference to the members of that board that they took it on the chin. They believe that we have not given them enough money, but they are going ahead with what we have given them. If they need more later, that can be considered.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Did the gentleman say that there would be twenty-six-million-and-odd beneficiaries of the Security Act?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is in connection with old-age benefits under title II.

Mr. MOTT. But there are not more than half that many in the United States who are over 60 years old.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is under title II of the act—the old-age benefits.

Mr. MOTT. There are only 10,000,000 people in the United States over 60 years of age, and our present Social Security Act takes care of only a fraction of those, and how could there be 26,000,000 people involved?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think the gentleman does not understand the provisions of title II. That is the Federal old-age benefit scheme. Taxes are imposed upon employers and employees with a view to building up a reserve fund for the payment of old-age benefits commencing in 1942. No one is eligible until he reaches age 65, but the taxes are based upon wages and commence July 1, 1937, and continue until the wage earner reaches 65. It will be a big preliminary job to take the census and get the initial information concerning everyone affected by the title. This title should not be confused with other provisions of the act that have to do with grants to States for old-age assistance under State law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I have been under the impression that the administration of the Social Security Act in all its phases was under the jurisdiction of the State, and I am wondering why it is necessary, if that is true, to have such a large Federal Board.

Mr. WOODRUM. Title II, old-age benefits, is entirely a Federal project.

Mr. MAY. But the other features of the bill are all under the States.

Mr. WOODRUM. But the Federal Government must supervise the administration of the State plans after they have been approved to the extent of seeing that they conform to the requirements of Federal law. The total appropriation for the social security in this bill is \$458,631,860. We did not make any cut in the grants to the States for old-age assistance, unemployment compensation, dependent children, or aid for the blind. We feel that perhaps in some instances the amounts were pretty liberally allowed; but, after all, if the States cooperate and comply, the money must be provided; and if they do not, the money will not be spent. So there will be no point in making an arbitrary cut in that item. We do make a cut of 20 percent in the administrative costs, which, after all, is where we have to try to save the money.

There is one other large item in connection with social security which comes under the Treasury Department. That is an appropriation of \$265,000,000, which is the estimated amount of the first annual premium for payments required under title II of the act, to be placed in the old-age reserve account and to be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury for the account. The amount appropriated is based upon calculations made in connection with enactment of the Social Security Act. It is estimated that a sum adequate to provide this appropriation will be realized from the taxes imposed under title VIII of the act. The estimated collection of such taxes for the period from January 1 to

June 30, 1937, is \$305,000,000. Making an allowance of \$40,000,000 for administrative expenses, leaves the figure of \$265,000,000 as equal to the amount appropriated for the old-age reserve account for the fiscal year 1937.

I think the House will be interested in the itemization of the various appropriations on account of the Social Security Act in this bill. I will insert a table giving a recapitulation of them:

Social Security Board, salaries and expenses.....	\$18,400,000
Grants to States for old-age assistance.....	85,000,000
Grants to States for administration of State unemployment compensation plans.....	29,000,000
Grants to States for aid to dependent children.....	35,000,000
Grants to States for aid to the blind.....	8,000,000
Securing and maintaining wage records for old-age benefits (nonrecurring).....	12,400,000
Total.....	187,800,000

Treasury Department:

First increment for old-age reserve account.....	265,000,000
Salaries in connection with maintenance and development of the old-age reserve account.....	31,860
Collection of taxes under titles VIII and IX by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.....	5,800,000

Total..... 270,831,860

Grand total, Social Security Act..... 458,631,860

I do not want to consume any more time. I have taken more than I intended already.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. And that has reference to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The Federal Government, the gentleman says, does not assume responsibility in the picking of employables. Will the gentleman tell us about the ruling that went from Washington on having to be on the relief roll in November in order to get a job. Was not that an edict from Washington?

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, yes; to that extent it had the effect of freezing the relief rolls as of that date, but it has never undertaken to say who would be entitled to be on relief rolls. If more people were certified from relief rolls than could be employed on a project, the W. P. A. would exercise a judgment as to which of those certified would be employed. But that is all.

Mr. GIFFORD. But they undertook to say that unless they were on relief rolls in November they could not get a job.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is true.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Is this total for the Post Office Department, forty-million-six-hundred-thousand-and-odd dollars a customary amount for a deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. Twenty-three million dollars of that is on account of the 40-hour law that was passed; the necessity for additional employees because of the 40-hour law. That law became effective October 1, 1935. This is the first appropriation made for that purpose. The rest of it is salaries for postmasters, costs of transportation, and additional employees on account of increased business. There has been a great acceleration in post-office business and that is a good omen of the progress of recovery.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. How did the committee arrive at the figure of \$85,000,000 for grants for old-age pensions?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is figured out on the basis of the number of States that have qualified. Twenty-nine States have plans already approved for participation. Based on plans submitted but not yet approved and based upon sessions of legislatures that are expected to pass cooperative laws this winter, this \$85,000,000 is the best calculation that can be made this far in advance. It is a pure estimate.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I figured out that only about 416,000 persons would get \$15 a month.

Mr. WOODRUM. Sixty million dollars might have been enough, or it might take \$100,000,000. We thought that \$85,000,000 would be about the right amount. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am only going to discuss the Works Progress appropriation item in this bill. Whatever I have to say on other items in the bill I will say as the items are reached when the bill is read. I propose to have something to say with reference to the Tennessee Valley operation, because I believe that needs considerable attention. I propose to say something about several other smaller items in the bill.

With reference to the action of the committee and the report on the bill on the question of social security items, I would say that with reference to the allotments to States and the appropriations which are required to be made for the set-up for reserves, which were described by the gentleman from Virginia, I do not see how there is any possible way of disturbing those items. Undoubtedly there will be demands for most of the funds, if not all of them, that are set up in the social security appropriations with reference to allotments. Of course, the item for reserve is an item which no one can tell about, but it is based upon estimates of the Treasury Department, largely, with reference to the amount of taxes that will be received.

With reference to the administrative expenses there is one thing to say. I think the committee has been a little liberal; but it is a new agency, and with the 20 percent below the Budget estimates on operating expenses, probably that is as well as we can do for the time being. I am in hopes that when they take their census they will take it on a basis which costs much less than the \$12,400,000 which has been allotted to them.

With reference to the Works Progress Administration appropriation, those of you who have a copy of the bill in front of you will find this item on page 21. It authorizes, roughly, the use of the whole of the \$1,425,000,000 for relief, or it authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed 15 percent above a definite figure which is named in the bill for different projects.

For instance, for highways, roads, and so forth, \$413,250,000.

For public buildings, \$156,750,000.

For parks, \$156,750,000.

For public utilities, including sewers, water supply, airports, and transportation facilities, \$171,000,000.

Flood control and other conservation, \$128,250,000.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. What is contemplated being used in the regulation to describe "other conservation" besides the flood control? The bill reads "and other conservation."

Mr. TABER. I do not know. No one has told us.

Mr. PARSONS. What do the hearings disclose in that connection, if anything?

Mr. TABER. The hearings disclose that \$45,000,000 was to be used for water conservation. Page 142 of the hearings deals with that particular subject, and the item is particularly expected to be expended in the Mountain States, such as Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, California, Oregon, the Dakotas, Montana, Texas, and Oklahoma. We have a big program of this character in Oklahoma. Those are local projects in contradistinction to the big national project, the whole idea being to raise the water level in all of those drought States.

Mr. PARSONS. There is nothing in the hearings to indicate that any part of that would be used for reforestation as a means in aid of flood control?

Mr. TABER. Nothing that I can remember.

Mr. PARSONS. Would this language, "other conservation", prevent this fund being used under the terms of this bill for the acquisition of forestry lands and reforestation as an aid in assistance of flood control?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it would. I think it would be possible to do that.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. May I say it would probably embrace soil erosion; the different methods of dealing with soil erosion.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think it would embrace the methods of handling soil erosion? Frankly, I do not. I had never heard of that. I asked them to tell us what it would do, and that is what I got. I did not know that that was involved in this particular item.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Where the gentleman was reading it gives \$85,500,000 for rehabilitation and relief to farmers.

Mr. TABER. I have not gotten that far yet. The last item I read was "flood control and other conservation, \$128,125,000."

White-collar projects, \$85,500,000.

Women's projects, \$85,500,000.

Miscellaneous, \$71,250,000.

National Youth Administration, \$71,250,000.

Rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers, \$85,500,000.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman tell us in some detail what this money is to be used for, if it is to be turned over to Mr. Tugwell?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is that going to be just turned over to Mr. Tugwell or is it going to be for real assistance to farmers?

Mr. TABER. I think this is going to be turned over to Mr. Tugwell. Frankly, I do not know any other way it can be done, or else Mr. Hopkins is going to take over the Tugwellian activities with reference to that subject. We were not told in the hearings, frankly.

Mr. MAVERICK. How much has Mr. Tugwell had annually; does the gentleman know?

Mr. TABER. I do not think he has had anything annually. Mr. Tugwell has had for the resettlement outfit out of the big appropriation of 1933, \$23,000,000; out of the appropriation of 1934, \$3,000,000; out of the appropriation of 1935, \$227,900,000. This, in effect, cuts him down to \$85,500,000. I do not know, frankly. There are several items that can be used for the Tugwellian activities. The resettlement activities can be carried on under two or three different items.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The chairman of the committee just advised me this morning, in answer to a question, that there were no funds here that could be used by Mr. Tugwell for resettlement.

Mr. TABER. But there are. This item for public buildings could be used on what they call the resettlement activity, \$150,750,000. This item for miscellaneous projects, \$71,000,000, could be used for that. It would have to be under the direction and supervision of the Works Progress Administration, but Tugwell could be designated to take charge of it. There is nothing in the world to stop it.

Mr. MAY. And the Administrator of the Works Progress Administration would have power under this bill to allocate it to Tugwell or any other bureau he wanted to?

Mr. TABER. He could put Tugwell in charge of it, certainly; there is no question about it. Frankly, I expect to offer an amendment when we get to that stage to prevent any funds being used for the effectuation of these foolish projects.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Just a question about white-collar projects, \$85,500,000. Would this cover such activities as the one known as Federal project no. 1? I have received many letters asking about that activity.

Mr. TABER. I do not know what Federal project no. 1 is, but it would cover eurythmic dancing, and it would cover this Baedeker book that the wife of the publicity agent of the Soviet Embassy has charge of, which has cost very nearly \$3,000,000 and on which about 5,000 people are working.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Can the gentleman say whether it covers music, painting, and the arts?

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. It is for that classification of activities?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but it might be used for other projects, too; it might be used for bookkeeping, accounting, auditing, checking up on income-tax returns, almost anything.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Is that an increase or decrease for this activity?

Mr. TABER. Oh, it is hard to tell. I would say there was not much difference.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Even though specific items are mentioned in the bill I do not think there is anything under this heading "Works Progress Administration" that prevents this whole fund being turned over to Mr. Tugwell.

Mr. TABER. Nothing would prevent its being turned over to him any more than designating the amounts to be used by any particular type of project; but Mr. Tugwell could be put in charge of the whole performance, so far as that goes.

Mr. CHURCH. Not even a dollar could be spent for these special items?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes, and I shall be obliged not to yield during this time because there are a few things I want to say myself.

Mr. Chairman, beginning in 1933 when the Roosevelt administration came in, there commenced a direct control over relief expenditures, a direct Federal control over every operation of every Federal contractor. There has been appropriated for relief, exclusive of credit agencies in that time, \$11,732,000,000.

Of this amount, in all probability about \$1,200,000,000 to \$1,300,000,000 will be left unexpended on the 1st of July. This estimate, of course, is more or less guesswork, and it might run up or down a couple of hundred million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the gross national debt as shown by the daily Treasury statement at the present time is \$31,425,000,000. The Federal guarantees amount to \$5,000,000,000. The bonus liability is \$2,500,000,000. This makes a total national debt of \$38,928,000,000.

The deficiency for the current year to date is \$2,637,000,000. The estimated deficiency for 1936 is \$6,000,000,000. At the present time there are approximately 22,000,000 persons dependent upon relief and relief employment, with a national deficit rolling up and a national expenditure for relief of three and a half to four billion dollars. The number of Federal employees on the Federal roll has gradually increased until at the present time there are 800,000 under the civil service, which does not include the numerous other agencies.

Mr. Chairman, the whole situation is a delicate one. That amount of national debt disturbs me, and it disturbs every thinking American. This should not be a partisan question. It should be a matter of American patriotism. [Applause.] Unless we get to the point where we can reduce the expenses of the Government to the point where we can meet our bills by the taxes collected we will soon get to the end of our rope, and that day will come at some time when most of us least expect it.

Frankly, I do not believe we can afford either the W. P. A. performance or any P. W. A. performance to provide employment. I do not believe that carrying folks on relief is half as demoralizing as putting them to work on these W. P. A. projects where they are supported by their shovels all day, just as that crowd is over there in front of the Supreme Court Building at this moment. The Members may go over there and look. They do not have to take my word for it. I do not believe we can pay out from \$1,000 to \$1,200 a year, and that is what the hearings show it costs for these W. P. A. employees, when, as a matter of fact, we can take care of a relief case for an average of \$33 per month or approximately \$400 per year.

This Federal contribution to relief under Federal direction has been completely demoralizing. In some States no contribution is made at all. In one State it amounts to less than 1 percent, and in 13 States to less than 10 percent. Efficient relief cannot be had in any State unless that State contributes enough toward the relief so that it will be interested in seeing that the relief money is honestly and efficiently spent. I hope it may be possible for the Congress to appreciate these problems and to realize that regardless of our desire for buildings, regardless of our desire to have fine structures and fine roads built in our respective districts, we cannot afford to go on with this P. W. A. relief or work employment for the poor people at the rate we are doing.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. If every Member of this House will just cross the Capitol grounds here and go to the Congressional Library and look at that W. P. A. job over there, which has been going on for 2 weeks, and observe that army of lazy, indifferent colored men standing on the handles of their shovels all day long doing nothing, they would get disgusted with the whole W. P. A. work.

Mr. TABER. It is completely demoralizing.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it is completely demoralizing. They are doing nothing. They are lazy and indifferent and will not work when they have work to do.

Mr. TABER. It destroys any pride they may have.

Mr. BLANTON. I have been watching them for 2 weeks in going back and forth to the House Office Building.

Mr. TABER. That is the existing situation. When the proper point is reached in this bill, I am going to offer an amendment which will turn this money over to the States with the provision that they contribute a reasonably decent amount, the work to be administered locally by people who know the local situation, who will be required to do it honestly, and will be interested through a legitimate, reasonable, local contribution. Let us see if we cannot cut down this terrific expense of relief.

I do not see any other way out of the matter. This demoralizing work is worse than no work at all. This terrific expense puts heavy taxes on the people and demoralizes and prevents an increase in employment. In spite of the terrific taxes which have been imposed in recent years, industry has added a million men to its rolls in the last 2 years, and this in spite of every discouragement to business and industry. Why can we not give industry and the workingmen a chance?

Mr. Chairman, let us give the workingman a chance to look forward to a coming day when again the skilled workmen may receive \$40 to \$50 a week for his work instead of being on a dole or a dole job at \$10 or \$12 a week.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, when the House of Representatives passed the Social Security Act, every Member of the House believed that act meant that where a State provided payment of \$15 a month pension to its aged citizens, 65 years of age or over, the Federal Government would match the sum and pay, through the State, an equal amount of \$15, so that each pensioner would receive \$30 per month. That was understood by every Member of the

House. If I am incorrect, I yield to any Member to say he or she did not so understand it.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. As I understand the gentleman's statement, it is with the limitation that the States would comply with the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Now, after some of the States have changed their constitutions and are providing to pay their \$15 per month, a new ruling has been made. For instance, Texas on August 24, 1935, had a State-wide election and changed its constitution by an overwhelming vote to pay a pension of \$15 to its citizens 65 years of age or over, to match a like sum of \$15 to be paid through it by the Government. Now, in Washington they have construed that to mean every State must pay \$30 and then be reimbursed \$15 by the Government. Inasmuch as the State of Texas is authorized to pay only \$15 per month, under such ruling, it would be reimbursed only \$7.50 by the Government, and instead of the aged people getting \$30 per month, as was intended by Congress, they will receive only \$15 per month, unless this Congress rectifies the matter by passing a proper amendment.

Now, is there a Member of the Congress here on the floor who understood there was to be any such interpretation as this? No; we all believed it would be a question of 50-50, \$15 from the State and \$15 from the Government, with such \$30 paid by the State, and we ought not to allow this interpretation to stand.

Mr. PIERCE. What is the difference?

Mr. BLANTON. There is just this difference, I will say to my friend. The State of Texas, thinking that this was the proper interpretation, passed a constitutional amendment authorizing a payment of only \$15 per month. It does not authorize a payment of \$30. The State cannot pay a pension of \$30 and then get \$15 back from the Government, because the Constitution does not authorize it, but that is what the Government is demanding of the State, and after passing a constitutional amendment whereby the State has authorization to pay \$15 a month, the Government now says that the aged people of Texas will get only \$15 a month, \$7.50 from the State and \$7.50 from the Government, paid through the State, because the Government will pay the State of Texas \$7.50 of the \$15 it pays to its people.

This is a fraud, not only upon the people, but a fraud upon the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment, I will yield.

I understand the Ways and Means Committee is arranging now to bring in an amendment to cover this question and provide for a proper interpretation, that where a State has arranged lawfully to pay a pension of \$15, the Government will come in and furnish its \$15 in accordance with the understanding of the membership of the Congress. This matter ought not to be delayed. The provision ought to be brought in by the Ways and Means Committee right away and passed and signed and become a law before we adjourn.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. In view of the gentleman's rather broad question to all the Members and the fact I asked him to yield before, I may say I did not fully understand the gentleman's position when I asked him to yield before. The question which the gentleman is now discussing has been considered by some of my colleagues and myself, and I understood the matter at the time, I will say to the gentleman, as the Federal authorities are now interpreting the law—that is, that the Federal Government would contribute one-half of what the States gave, or reimburse the States one-half of what they paid out in old-age pensions, up to \$30 a month, but not that they would match the amount that the States gave. This was my understanding of the law.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry, but I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman addressed a broad question to the Members of the House and should yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that the few minutes I have remaining will not permit my yielding. There is one other matter that I wish to discuss.

ALIENS HERE UNLAWFULLY MUST NOT TAKE WORK FROM NEEDY AMERICANS

There has been a careful check-up by various organizations in the United States in behalf of American citizens, and it has been ascertained that there are in the United States right now at least three and a half million aliens who are here unlawfully and ought not to be here. Of this number there are at least 400,000 unlawful aliens who have been getting relief and who are now taking work under W. P. A. and under P. W. A. jobs all over the United States that American citizens are entitled to and should fill.

There is not another government in the world that would permit this except the United States. Great Britain will not allow an alien to hold a job as long as one of its nationals is without a job. The Government of France will not allow an alien to hold a job in France as long as one of its nationals is without a job. The Government of Germany and the Government of Italy will not allow an alien to hold a job as long as one of their nationals is without a job. Our country is the only one that will permit aliens to be cared for in this way when there is an American citizen wanting the job that the alien holds.

There is going to be an amendment offered from the floor to stop this, and the amendment will provide that no alien who has come here unlawfully since 1924 shall get paid out of the \$1,425,000,000 provided in this bill.

I hope to see this amendment passed unanimously. Our friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bacon] is going to offer the amendment. I am going to vote for it. It is a good amendment. It is an American amendment and one that ought to pass. The idea of taking care of aliens who have come here from other countries unlawfully when American citizens who were born here and whose families have lived here for generations are without work and with wives and little children starving! It is infamous to think of it. We ought to pass such an amendment without any hesitation whatever, and I hope there will not be a vote against it in this House. Such an amendment should become the law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Reverting to the Social Security Act, my State has made provision for an appropriation or expenditure of \$7.50 to be matched by the United States Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Then your State will get only \$3.75 from the Government, and you will be able to pay only \$7.50 monthly pension to your citizens unless we pass an amendment. If that is the provision of law in your State, the old-age pensioners in your district will receive only \$7.50 per month and your State will get back from the Government only \$3.75 on each of them.

Mr. SPENCE. Is that the ruling they have made?

Mr. BLANTON. That is the ruling, but it is not what was understood by the membership of this House.

Mr. SPENCE. No; it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. And it ought to be straightened out right away. The people of this country are entitled to have the will of their Congress put into effect and not misconstrued or misinterpreted in this way.

Mr. SPENCE. It was not understood in that way by the people of Kentucky.

Mr. BLANTON. No; it was not.

Mr. SPENCE. Because since that time they have amended their constitution so that they could make the necessary appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. Everyone here so understood it, and the entire debate indicated there would be a matching by the Government of the \$15 provided by the State, though paid through the State. It was said here a hundred times on this floor that the State would give \$15 and the Government would

give \$15, all paid through the State, which would make up the \$30 monthly pension to our aged people.

The Ways and Means Committee should bring in a provision which should be passed by unanimous consent to straighten this out.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD and to relieve the apparent apprehensions of my colleague from Texas.

If there is any misapprehension of the Social Security Act, it is not due to ambiguity or lack of clarity in the act. There is nothing in the language of the act which with the wildest stretch of the imagination would allow the people of Virginia to believe that if they paid \$15 the Federal Government would pay \$15, that whatever Virginia paid they would match it with an equal amount.

It is unfortunate if some States have adopted a constitution under a misapprehension or changed their constitution under a misapprehension, for I do not believe that there are many Members on the floor who had a contrary understanding if they paid any attention to the debates at the time.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAPES. This is a matter which has been discussed between some of my colleagues and myself. Did the gentleman speak advisedly when he said the Federal Government would match the allowance of the States?

Mr. WOODRUM. Reimburse the States.

Mr. MAPES. My understanding was that if the State agreed to pay \$10 a month or \$5 a month, or any amount up to \$30, the Federal Government would contribute one-half of the sum, or reimburse the State to that extent.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Mr. MAPES. But not that the Federal Government would match or duplicate the amount of the State contribution—

Mr. WOODRUM. The Federal Government would reimburse the State 50-50 up to \$30 a month.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree with the gentleman entirely. That is my understanding of the law. Does not the gentleman believe, in view of the fact that Texas and perhaps some other States have changed their constitutions under an apparent misunderstanding, it would be easier for the Congress to change the law so that it would conform to the constitutional provisions of the States? I think we should do that at this session.

Mr. WOODRUM. I quite agree with that, and I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means can find a way to have it carried out in the way that Congress desired, but I don't think it is fair to say that any arbitrary decision of the Security Board or somebody else has altered the will of Congress.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. KENNEY. Under the ruling is a State required to pay every month, or could it pay every 6 months?

Mr. WOODRUM. The Federal Government advances to the States on a quarterly basis on the basis that they furnish data as to what they are paying on old-age assistance on a monthly basis.

Mr. KENNEY. The State must pay out every month?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is my understanding.

Mr. KENNEY. They could not pay out 1 month for 2 months?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think so. It is on a monthly basis.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want it understood that my remarks this morning will be made in the performance of my duties as a member of the Committee on Expenditures. As the ranking man on that committee, I feel that it is my responsibility to help the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations. They, however, have had some-

what the advantage of me. I cannot get my committee to function.

This report came out only this morning. The latter part of it consists of tables. I have been able to skim over fairly well the rest of the report in order to get the gist of it. This will be a difficult vote for me next Monday, after the criticisms which I now expect to make and the feeling I have about it, but it is the only relief bill that we will have brought here. I recognize the problem of relief, and I want to vote adequate money therefor, and in consequence I shall probably vote for this measure. But do not misunderstand me; do not think that is any surrender of my viewpoint on the manner in which relief has been, or should be, distributed. I have often spoken on these relief measures; and if any of us dare to criticize, our words are often misinterpreted and purposely so. The opponents will take one brief sentence out of our remarks and without further explanation use it for political purposes. I realize how dangerous it is to talk about relief, but my position here will not allow me not to do so.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who spoke for the committee today, said that he was won over after listening to Mr. Hopkins; that Hopkins had a hard job and boondoggling represented only one-seventeenth of 1 percent—too small to talk about. And the Reedsville proposition—that is also a small matter, too small to talk about! He was not asked regarding resettlement, about which I have much material which I ought to have time to read. It is an unfortunate thing that we have to search through all these periodicals and newspapers to get information which we have reason to believe to be authentic, because we cannot get it from the officials themselves, who ought to have appeared before my committee. I should like to have had Mr. Rex Tugwell before my committee to explain about resettlement matters. Perhaps he would win me over, as Harry Hopkins won over the gentleman from Virginia.

Then the gentleman tells me that I have not read the report and do not know anything about relief. Come into my office and let me show you my scrapbooks, gotten together over a period of 3 years and consisting largely of editorial criticism and general information telling of the failures which you yourselves now acknowledge. I took the floor here and suffered the weariness of the struggle for the truth concerning that C. W. A., which you are now only too anxious to forget. Then you switched to the F. E. R. A., but after a year of that you were again anxious to change the whole policy. It did not work either. Now you have the W. P. A., and Harry Hopkins told you there was no politics in it. You apparently fell for that, apparently believed it, and you did not question him very much about it after he had stated, "I will put into the record here the results of our investigations." Then you dropped the subject. You say that he did not change his opinion from day to day. Why, he had to. Questioned from day to day as to how he arrived at allocating the money to the different States, he was obliged to change his statements. After 3 long years of experience, 3 long years, you are no nearer to knowing how to spend the money than you were at the beginning. But no advice is wanted. Why did you set on that committee and let him tell you there was no politics in Pennsylvania or in New York? At least one gentleman from Pennsylvania—a real Democrat—will talk about this. There are going to be a few Democrats here who will have the courage to stand up and show where, even in the matter of nominations as between Democrats, the relief rolls were used to defeat candidates. We have such an abundance of that sort of thing that Harry Hopkins' words here are but a hollow mockery.

After 3 long years what I am particularly interested in is the policy of handling funds for relief.

An amendment will be offered that half of this money be given over for direct relief. That is becoming the really approved method of using such funds. Change the present policy. It does not work. I deeply regret that our Committee on Expenditures has not been permitted to function. It

is not the policy of this administration to have expenditures investigated. The matter is left wholly with the overworked Appropriations Committee, which has but little time for it. Their business is to look into future appropriations. We have to rely on getting our information from other sources, perhaps you think in devious ways. Although General Johnson's report was suppressed, I will quote what now seems to be admitted as true. General Johnson says they purloined his report. Somebody stole it. What a pity that you have to steal reports regarding public business!

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield for a moment?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. With reference to the question of whether or not the Appropriations Committee went into the question of relief carefully, I call attention to the fact that the hearings number 490 pages, and they consumed a number of days, and we had such distinguished and able members of that committee as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, that is the entire deficiency report.

Mr. WOODRUM. Well, that is on relief.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is on your C. C. C. and different credit agencies. I am talking about W. P. A., which is this separate report.

Mr. WOODRUM. This is the investigation of relief which the gentleman condemns and is going to vote for.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not condemn relief. Let the gentleman get that into his mind. I will vote every dollar necessary for relief which is not wasteful, extravagant, and based on the wrong policy. I love my people who are poor, just as much as the gentleman loves his people who are poor, and I will match the gentleman in what I will do for those people at any time at any place.

Mr. WOODRUM. But how can the gentleman vote for such an iniquitous administration measure as he is now condemning?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Roosevelt is the only President we have. This is seemingly the only way he will do it. If I do not vote for it, I get nothing. We well understand that. Why try to put me in that sort of position?

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman puts himself in that position. I did not put him in it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no. I began by telling you why I would vote for it. The gentleman knows why he would like to put the Republican Party in that position. We disapprove of your methods; but after our futile efforts are exhausted, you in the majority will have to take the responsibility, and there is nothing for most of us to do but to go along. We recognize that. General Johnson did say, and he tacitly admitted that he said it, "that 60 percent of this inventive work is unwholesome, wasteful, and a fatuous gesture." The only argument is that it preserves pride instead of creating the humiliation of home relief; yet to get on work relief the rules require that a man must go on home relief. And to get there he must submit to the equivalent of a pauper's oath and a most humiliating inquisition. If a man on relief earns a fugitive dollar in any private employment, he risks the loss of any kind of relief. Quoting further from General Johnson:

More than half of all this effort is pretense, justified by nothing. I note that the Government relief plans will be all work and no dole. If it is, imagination must become more fanciful, and practical results more parsimonious.

What does Mr. Ritter, the present man in charge of New York City relief, say?—

One of the main problems we face now is trying to adjust the situation so as not to make W. P. A. so pleasant, so interesting, and so secure that people just come here and stay.

He goes on to say that their relief rolls have increased 50 percent. Hopkins has made relief work so attractive that, where people were taking care of relatives heretofore, they are now going on relief. No wonder Hopkins says it is perma-

nent. That has nothing to do with bringing the country back to prosperity. There are a million and a half on relief as a result of the scarcity doctrine of A. A. A. Now, you say you can take care of only 2,000,000 people. There are a million and a half to be taken care of right there. You have to take care of many, even in my section. Of course, I am to vote for relief. Our people are frightened. If they have a dollar, they will not spend it. It is frozen. We used to be able to live a good deal through each other. We would hand work back and forth and get along. Now everyone hesitates to risk anything. The wheels of industry are moving, but individuals all over the country are still afraid to risk whatever they may possess, no matter what this Government has done to allay such fears. It has guaranteed bank deposits; it has thrown the whole Government behind everything; yet the individual will not employ his neighbor, lest he be not employed in return. If he has a dollar, he is hanging on to it.

As an illustration: In my section there is a little summer community of 80 homes. They have a caretaker who is a carpenter, a plumber, a painter. He can do almost anything. There are 80 homes owned by summer people, supposed to be fairly well to do. Every winter heretofore he has had considerable work. He has not had 1 day's work from December 1 to March 1 this year. Yet you say prosperity has returned. Confidence has not returned. A million and a half of sharecroppers thrown on relief and other millions still out of jobs, because of this lack of confidence. Of course, relief is here to stay, no matter how prosperous industrial business may become. This relief business, in Mr. Hopkins' opinion, seems to be permanent. Our people have been taught that the Treasury of the Federal Government is inexhaustible. They appear to believe that we have plenty of money here, an invisible supply. They do not seem to understand that the funds we are now voting them must all be paid back by themselves, even with interest added.

What a time we had last November when men who had kept off relief could obtain no recognition for W. P. A. work. They saw others, who might need aid much less than they, taken on P. W. A. projects while they, simply because they were not on relief in November, were ruled out. By whom? By the edict from Washington.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Up to about 100 years ago it was the accepted practice in surgery to bleed the patient, no matter what the ailment was. We are now trying to bleed ourselves well.

Mr. GIFFORD. Apparently. We are giving ourselves presents that we shall have to pay for.

Boondoggling! I am not criticizing it per se, but we hear even dancing masters say they are forced to close their dancing schools and themselves go on relief because the Government is competing with them and teaching dancing without tuition cost. Many such legitimate private enterprises are going by the board, because of Federal interference with private business. Boondoggling! That is only one-seventeenth of 1 percent of it, they say; it does not amount to anything. But the policy amounts to something. It is so small a part of these relief expenditures, they assert. I wonder if resettlement plans are also regarded as too small a matter to discuss?

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CURLEY. The gentleman mentioned boondoggling.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will call it "votedoggling", if the gentleman would prefer.

Mr. CURLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the word "boondoggling" was coined by a Republican administration of the city of New York, and the man who coined it came from the gentleman's own State, Mr. John Marshall. This statement comes from the official record of the investigation of relief in the city of New York.

Mr. GIFFORD. Be he Democrat or Republican, he believes, undoubtedly with President Roosevelt, that this word "is to be enshrined in the hearts of the American people."

Mr. CURLEY. I would inform the gentleman also that eurythmic dancing also originated under a Republican administration in the State of New York.

Mr. GIFFORD. But all this is a small matter. I should not criticize it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that the only good thing about it?

Mr. GIFFORD. Now I come to a report of the situation in Pennsylvania. You must have read the criticism of the former director of relief of that State. Are we not going to be impressed by the reports of men who formerly had charge of these matters? I want a little of it to appear in the Record, and now I shall read an extract or two regarding Pennsylvania. There are no politics in relief in Pennsylvania, are there? Hopkins says he has investigated them and has fired anybody who played politics with relief. Of course it is now fixed up all right.

This former relief administrator of Pennsylvania stated:

I believe the sooner the present works program is given up the better it will be for President Roosevelt's political future and for the Nation at large.

Not only are the workers themselves, in the main, dissatisfied, but the taxpayers, watching thousands of workers on W. P. A. projects doing little more than killing time, are becoming embittered toward relief expenditures of that kind.

Originally, I felt that President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins were dead right in starting the works-progress program, because I thought, as they did, that it would be possible to give municipalities needed improvements at a low cost and at the same time give workmen the self-respect that comes from earning what they are receiving.

But the sad fact is that municipalities are getting improvements that could be supplied much more cheaply under contract and with up-to-date equipment. The other side of the picture is that a workman does not gain in self-respect by knowing that he is doing with a shovel and a wheelbarrow what could be done 10 times more efficiently and economically by a steam shovel and a truck.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. Why is it, then, that mayors of all the cities of the country come to Washington to have the work-relief program continued?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, the gentleman knows full well that the mayors of cities, and many very wealthy cities, are very careful about the money from their own funds that they spend for relief. I know of municipality after municipality which do not owe a dollar, with a very low tax rate, that are begging for the money. Some of them say: "Why should we not take it, why should we not ask for it, we contribute largely, do we not?" Think of it! You may be assured that the people of New England, in their town meetings, watch the tax rate closely and watch very carefully how they pay money out for relief. Why should they not take the money from W. P. A. when they witnessed in 1933 the pressure put on Hopkins to spend the money by Christmas? He sent a check to every municipality, no matter how wealthy it was. You remember that. What a method of distributing funds for strictly "relief" purposes! And after 3 long years they still do not know how to spend money for real relief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Tugwell has spent \$46,000,000, but it cost \$19,000,000 to spend it. Some explanation of that fact would seem to be in order. But in the hearings there seems to be none.

They spent this W. P. A. money largely for what, in your community and mine? They got us to put in water plants and all sorts of things. They baited us by stating they would give 45 percent, although in many of the States the Federal Government gave practically the entire amount.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM. My friend has been speaking of politics and relief. I am wondering what my friend would think of

the proposition of severely condemning the administration of relief as is now being administered, and then voting for it? What about a little politics in that?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman seems to delight in bringing that matter up.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; but I would like to know what my friend thinks about that matter?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have to vote for relief, and this is the only relief bill that we shall have a chance to vote on. I want to provide relief just as much as the gentleman does.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MORAN. The gentleman has referred to other States where relief has been mishandled, in his opinion. Does the gentleman intend to insert a list of projects in his own congressional district that he disapproves?

Mr. GIFFORD. I could insert a lot of them. I could name a long list, which involved our going in debt for something for which we could not afford to pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman who spoke on behalf of the committee, are we to blame if they bring in a skunk with a litter of kittens and we have to take them?

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman from Virginia has to resort to that sort of thing he cannot get very far. That does not excuse the bill or the failures in the bill.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman's ability and earnestness, but I am wondering if he will not agree with those of us who believe in public works that now when we have great distress in the country we should engage in all possible public work which will build America?

Mr. GIFFORD. If the P. W. A. would help unemployment, all right, but it did not do that in England, and it has not accomplished its purpose here. It is too slow. We cannot seem to have projects planned and in readiness to proceed upon.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I may say that the group with which I have been associated has always advocated national planning—getting ready for adverse times in times of prosperity so that when famines and depressions come we are ready. That is the reason we have failed at this time. We were not ready when the depression came. There was no national planning in advance.

Mr. GIFFORD. You might make a report and hand it to Harry Hopkins, but he would say: "I should cry. Send that to the poor." That is what he said when he got a certain report from one group of real businessmen.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. I have been listening with interest to the gentleman's remarks, and I conclude from his remarks that the gentleman is in favor of a relief appropriation and recognizes the necessity for making a relief appropriation?

Mr. GIFFORD. I certainly do.

Mr. HEALEY. But the gentleman is criticizing the administration of the present relief program?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman does admit, however, there is a dire necessity for a relief appropriation and he is going to vote for it?

Mr. GIFFORD. I would be very foolish not to do so, and there is no politics in my vote. I want to remind the gentleman who mentioned politics for voting for relief that no one can suggest that I have shown any lack of courage in my votes on the floor of this House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman, or anyone else, explain to us what justification there can be for the sum recommended in this bill while 700,000 W. P. A. employees are being thrown out and discharged? What provisions are being made to take care of them except private business?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman well knows this sum does not take care of them. In New York City unemployment has grown 50 percent, and yet the gentlemen on this side get up here and praise God for the way industry has come back.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we love to hear those speeches on prosperity. Certainly industry is coming back. But the number on relief rolls is growing greater on account of the Soil Conservation Act, on account of the continuation of the A. A. A., and the punitive measures adopted affecting industry. What are we going to do with this army that has been deliberately thrown out of work?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it not true that while industry is coming back the dividends of many of the great corporations are constantly increasing, and that the reason for the continuance of a vast amount of unemployment is those corporations are not willing to divide their profits with the men who work in their mills and factories?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; that is not the answer. The answer is the A. A. A. and the Soil Conservation Act and other punitive measures directed at industry. With this fund we can take care of only 2,000,000. The gentleman was not here a few minutes ago when I stated the answer to his question. It is a country-wide proposition, not an industrial one. The ordinary country person will not pass his money about as he used to. That is the answer. Industry itself has to a large degree recovered, but free interchange of labor is almost entirely lacking over the entire Nation outside of the industrial districts.

Mr. WITHROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman criticizes spending money for rural resettlement. Does the gentleman realize that the money spent by Mr. Tugwell's department for rural resettlement in the State of Wisconsin has been money very well spent; that they have received back a dollar for every dollar that has been spent; and that there is a real demand as well as a real need for additional allocations in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, has the gentleman read the story of Jasper County? Has he read many other stories that I could furnish him; and why should Wisconsin or any other State be picked out, or any particular locality selected, to carry on such an experiment when any relief expenditures should be universal? What right have we to select any special community to put over something of that kind?

Mr. WITHROW. There has been nothing pulled over in Wisconsin. The project is being administered properly there.

Mr. GIFFORD. All these expenditures should be used in such a way that every community would be treated according to its needs; and it should be done under State and local supervision and by direct relief. You will learn that this is the only answer, and 1 year from now you will come to it yourselves. There is an absolute demand that everybody who is now suffering shall be taken care of, and it cannot be done by trying to scheme out some form of made-work relief. Why can you not recognize this now and confess that your present plan is a failure? It is a failure, and everybody knows it. Your President said he would recognize failure and he would invite criticism, but he never recognizes a mistake and never stands for criticism.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. How would you do it?

Mr. GIFFORD. By direct relief. That would be the easiest way and would do away with all this bureaucracy. I do not know that I pronounce the word correctly, but it is a word that is causing concern in the minds of the people of the country generally.

Mr. KELLER. How would you get away from that?

Mr. GIFFORD. With respect to your people in Missouri, I do read occasionally about St. Louis, Mo., and the Pendergast machine. Perhaps politics would get into it even there, would it not?

Mr. KELLER. I do not think so.

Mr. GIFFORD. If politics would not get into it in St. Louis, then it would not get into it anywhere; but direct relief is the answer. The present method has failed to provide adequate relief to those in need thereof, because it is a wrong method.

Mr. KELLER. I am asking for the gentleman's remedy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

W. P. A. O. K., BUT SO IS PUBLIC WORKS AND RURAL RESETTLEMENT

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat in the same position as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], who preceded me. I am a little bit confused, and I am going to make a few criticisms as I go along, and, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, I am going to vote for the bill. I say nothing, however, in bitterness.

I just want to converse on this question of legislation in general for a moment. The manner in which this bill is brought to the floor has been customary, I presume, for a hundred years. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill comes in here without anybody except a subcommittee knowing anything about it. And the first thing we all do, by unanimous consent, including our opposition over here [Mr. MAVERICK indicating the Republican side], is to make a waiver by which we absolutely abandon our legislative processes as applied to all the other committees. The Appropriations Committee offers their bill, and I presume there is considerable legislation in it, and we have waived all points of order. So the result is going to be there will only be one committee of any importance in the House of Representatives, and that will be the Appropriations Committee. If this is true, I hope I get on it.

In any event, we gave up our legislative rights in this particular case, and I have no particular criticism, because I could have objected but did not. But neither did the Republicans; it is merely an example of Congress abandoning legislative processes and railroading ourselves out of our rights.

PRINT OF BILL NOT EVEN AVAILABLE TO CONGRESS

Another thing is that the bill was not available, and this is customary and has been the custom for years. But how can a man make an intelligent talk on this bill or a constructive talk when we are handed the hearings of probably 1,000 pages on which these other gentlemen have worked for 2 months, and then we are supposed to get up here and debate the bill and vote with deliberation. In fact, the bill is not even available at this time. I tried to get a bill for about half an hour, and finally I borrowed one from the courteous chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WOODRUM], the gentleman from Virginia. This is the only way I was able to get a copy of the bill.

It would seem to me that we should adopt a policy of getting out reports at least a week ahead on ordinary legislation like this. With reports gotten out ahead we could inform ourselves and legislate more carefully, and certainly with more knowledge.

ARMY AND NAVY—DO WE DISCUSS FUNDAMENTALS?

Let us talk about legislation in particular reference to this matter, because it is more or less relevant. When we are talking about the Army and the Navy we talk about battle cruisers and cruisers and battleships, and we bandy statistics around. But we say nothing about the economic background in reference to these huge appropriations.

I come from the biggest military district in the United States and, I think, the biggest one in the world. My district probably profited financially from the World War. We suffered a break-down afterward, of course. My people are assisted, to a large extent, by military appropriations. But

I do not think that my district or this Nation can have permanent prosperity entirely by military and naval appropriations. I just do not think we can do that. We must develop our interior and our exterior, world trade, and promote peace. I think some day we ought to get down to it and discuss whether it is really necessary to have one of the biggest navies in the world, which is to go all over the world in some sort of fantastic empire.

You know civilization has always been destroyed when there is a great concentration of wealth, along with the building pyramids or nonproductive buildings of all kinds, developed side by side with a royal military force. It seems to me that we are headed somewhat in that direction. I voted for the Navy appropriation bill, and I voted for the Army appropriation bill, but I wonder if we are solving our problems in this way.

POLITICS IN W. P. A.—NOT MUCH, BUT THEY ARE HUMAN

Now, let us get down to this W. P. A. appropriation we are debating today. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to say publicly or privately that Harry Hopkins is one of the ablest men in the United States, and he is doing a fine job. Has there been any politics? Of course, there has been politics in the W. P. A., just like there was politics in the Republican days, and just as there will be if that party comes into power again; or just as there will be if a third party comes into power.

But I will say this, that there has been a minimum of politics, and Hopkins has been doing a fine job under the most difficult conditions.

I am wondering this: Is there any permanent recovery under the W. P. A.? Are we going to put people back to work permanently by the W. P. A. appropriations? Personally I do not think so. I think the W. P. A. is absolutely necessary, but there is no permanent benefit coming from it.

RURAL RESETTLEMENT SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Let me say a word or two about the rural resettlement. That is criticized to a large extent because it is under Mr. Tugwell, called both doctor and professor, who went to college and got more than one degree. They say there is something wrong in a man that gets two degrees from college.

The rural resettlement is doing just about the most important work in the United States today. Suppose you put aside Mr. Tugwell—suppose you send him back to college—the work will have to go on just the same. Soil erosion, destruction of forests, the poverty of the rural people, tenants, and sharecroppers everywhere—something must be done about it, and we should not abandon our program.

Now, what is Mr. Tugwell, or rather the Rural Resettlement Administration doing? The Administration has taken 600,000 farmers off relief and put them back into self-respecting productive work. That is a substantial accomplishment, and more must be done, whether Tugwell lives or dies.

When you put a man on relief you have to keep feeding him forever. When you get him back on the land and back in the economic system, you have done something worth while. And that is what rural resettlement is doing.

As I understand, last year he got something like \$250,000,000. This year, although his Department is not mentioned here, he is to get something like \$85,000,000. If we appropriated \$250,000,000 last year, \$85,000,000 this year is not sufficient.

SHALL WE EARMARK \$700,000,000 FOR W. P. A.?

Take the W. P. A.—there are a large number of Congressmen who want to earmark \$700,000,000 of that for the Public Works Administration under Secretary Ickes.

I have been talking about that thing, and I have been studying it. One billion five hundred million dollars does not appear to be enough; at least, last year we appropriated \$4,800,000,000. I make bold to say that and I am willing to vote an increase in the appropriation if the expenditure can be invested intelligently and conservatively, as I think has been done under the Public Works Administration.

MONEY PROPERLY INVESTED IS NOT WASTED

They say, "Where are you going to get the money?" When you take money and put it into permanent economic programs you get the money back, and then you are not wasting money, but you are investing money wisely. Let us say that the P. W. A. has about a billion dollars worth of work that they can start now. They make a grant on that of 45 percent, or \$450,000,000. That money all practically comes back to the Federal Treasury, because P. W. A. charges a rate of interest of something like 3½ or 4 percent, and the Government borrows the money at a much lower rate. This may be stretching a point, but it is true P. W. A. is legitimate, sound business.

I believe some way should be found, if possible, to increase this appropriation for the P. W. A., because the P. W. A. is doing a permanent, high-class piece of work in this country.

P. W. A., they say, has been slow. Possibly that was for the best; Ickes is a cautious man and has been careful from every angle. But slow or not, the P. W. A. is ready now with legitimate, self-liquidating projects that run at least seven hundred million and probably a billion dollars.

P. W. A. AND RESETTLEMENT OUTSTANDING AGENCIES

In a general way the Rural Resettlement and the P. W. A. are really the outstanding agencies in the Government today that are doing work which is of a permanent nature, from the viewpoint of rehabilitating rural people and agricultural land and city people and industrial business, in an economic structure. For that reason we ought to do something about keeping these agencies going.

Ickes and Tugwell and Hopkins get a lot of criticism, and largely because they have hard jobs to fill. I asked a colleague a minute ago which he like the best, Tugwell or Hopkins, and he said he liked one just about as much as he did the other, and he meant by that that he did not like either one of them. He has never met either of them, but has had some pleasure in hating them at a distance. We get a lot of criticism from the other side of the House on our Administrators, and some from our own side. The Republicans are constantly talking about "Tugwellian philosophy" and about "boondoggling", which, in my opinion, is entirely superficial criticism, because no sensible substitute or program is offered.

Some day we must get down to the fundamental question of what we—and I here mean Republicans and Democrats, Progressives and Farmer-Laborites, all of us—are going to do. And let us discuss some of the things that we have not done. We have not even gotten the Bankhead Tenant Act on the floor, which is to rehabilitate sharecroppers, tenants, and landless agricultural workers. We have not gotten out any housing bill, and we have not gotten out any real conservation bill. All these matters concern permanent recovery, and those matters I mentioned must be faced. As far as I know, we have not any particularly well-integrated or definite plan of what we are going to do.

This is not an anti-Democratic speech. I am for the Democratic Party. I am for President Roosevelt. I am for what we are trying to do, but sometimes I am not sure that we are doing everything that we should. Sometimes I think we wince under superficial criticism of the Republicans and our reactionary enemies—and they have not any program, nothing to offer, or anything sensible to say. I have heard the Republicans talk today, and all they have done is stand in this well and criticize what the Democratic Party is doing. They make absolutely no constructive suggestions whatever. They say we are doing wrong, and that we have to stop this relief program, this, and that, with some talk of alphabets, although no more talk about the "brain trust." What the Republicans think does not seem to be much. The question is, What are we going to do?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I gladly yield to the distinguished leader of my party.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the gentleman have some hopes that the new Republican "brain trust" may evolve some policy for the Republican Party very soon?

Mr. MAVERICK. I am afraid not. I have found out that they have one man in the Republican "brain trust" who is a Socialist from way back, and I have walked the floor at night a great deal about that. Then there is something else that I have heard. Last night there was a red flag hung on the Supreme Court flagpole, and they found a Harvard magazine under it, and I think that must have been Professor Carver, of the Republican "brain trust", who did that. I understand that he was in the neighborhood just about that time.

TUGWELL TRADES CAP AND GOWN FOR STEEL HELMET AND RHINOCEROS HIDE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. No matter what the Republican "brain trust" does, it cannot hope to equal the Democratic "brain trust" in damn foolishness—

Mr. MAVERICK. Brains—you mean in brains. You cannot hope to equal the Democratic "brain trust" in brains. You know that you are jealous.

Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman spoke something about Mr. Tugwell leaving his office and what might or might not happen should that come to pass. Does the gentleman believe that perhaps we may be able to go to the Republican "brain trust" and find somebody to take his place?

Mr. MAVERICK. No, and I will tell the reason why you cannot. You cannot do it for two reasons. One of them is that the Republican "brain trust" has not as much brains as the Democratic "brain trust", and the second is that Tugwell has been in for 3 years now, and he has gotten a good deal of the doctorate worn off him, he has been kicked around so much, and has now become a pretty good administrator. He has traded his cap and gown for a steel helmet and a rhinoceros hide.

Mr. GIFFORD. And what the gentleman is trying to say, paradoxically, is that a "brain trust" is an asinine thing anyway.

Mr. MAVERICK. The Republican one; yes. Our "brain trust" is a good one. But I want to say in conclusion that I really believe, instead of voting for this bill as it is, that we ought to do something for the P. W. A. and the Rural Resettlement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman made one observation that I am very much interested in and I want to see if I understood him correctly. I understood the gentleman to say that Tugwell had been given \$250,000,000.

Mr. MAVERICK. Last year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With which he had cared for 600,000 farm families.

Mr. MAVERICK. That is what I understand the figures show, and he has not only cared for, but has rehabilitated many of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then if that is so, if my figures are correct, that, of course, would be \$411.66 per family.

Your observation startles me. It is some information I have overlooked. I want to ask where I can get the details on this statement.

Mr. MAVERICK. From the Rural Resettlement; and you can also find that there has been comparatively more permanent rehabilitation per dollar than there has been through any other agency. I cannot give statistics, but from a viewpoint of principle the idea is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of any Republican in the House who claims any interest in that "brain

trust" and who is not willing that you should take over whatever they may have down there at Republican headquarters?

Mr. MAVERICK. But you know they hired that "brain trust."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who hired him?

Mr. MAVERICK. Your own leaders, of course; BERT SNELL and your other leaders. You know very well you agreed on that "brain trust." You cannot deny that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. We do not have any "brain trust." You have a patent on the "brain trust."

Mr. MAVERICK. You have what purports to be one; the fact remains you complained of a Democratic "brain trust" for 3 years, then studied the matter over and hired one yourself.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that what Tugwell is doing is paying relief to 200,000 farmers, and that he has not taken any off of relief?

Mr. MAVERICK. No, no. Mr. Tugwell—that is, the Rural Resettlement Administration—is rehabilitating some 600,000 farmers, many of whom to all intents and purposes are rehabilitated permanently.

Now, let me conclude with a short review or with some repetitions. First, legislatively, either we are all passing the buck, both Republicans and Democrats, or giving up many of our legislative processes such as in the waiver we unanimously passed today. That is a bad precedent. Second, the idea of bringing in a bill which no one has had a chance to read seems to me to be a bad policy, and that a better one would be to bring in a bill ahead of time and give the Members a chance to study and therefore legislate intelligently. Third, W. P. A. is absolutely necessary, and we must pass at least the \$1,500,000,000 bill. But, aside from that, the Rural Resettlement and Public Works Administrations are both essential to the economic set-up of this Nation and should be carried on as absolutely necessary on the part of our economic system. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAIN].

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, on January 14, 1936, I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I made some comments on President Roosevelt's message of January 3 on the state of the Union. I did not expect any reaction or comment from the President or members of his Cabinet. I did not suppose that any of them had time to read speeches of a new Congressman of the opposite political party. A portion of my speech was intended as a challenge to the members of the President's party, who constitute a majority of the membership of the House.

Under date of March 14, 1936, I received a communication from the Honorable Harold Ickes in which he calls my attention to the fact that I made the following statement in that speech:

The misfeasance—and I may add the malfeasance—in the administration of W. P. A. and P. W. A. projects as partisan enterprises for political profit has reacted against the administration and its sponsors.

And the Secretary of the Interior concludes his communication as follows:

If I have been guilty of anything in the administration of the Public Works program it is that I have been overzealous in my insistence that the program be administered without scandal and without regard to partisan politics. I feel so strongly on this point that I must challenge the truth of your charges and demand their proof.

Evidently the Administrator of Public Works is particular about the company in which his alphabetical symbols are found. Most of us who make up the membership of this House commenced our educational processes by learning the alphabet. Today pursuant to some strange pedagogical theory, children learn to read without learning the alphabet. Until the advent of the administration of "Roosevelt the

Lesser" there was grave possibility that our youngsters would grow up without learning the alphabet. It is an amazing but somewhat serious fact, that our young people are at quite a disadvantage in their efforts to locate words in the dictionary. They have trouble finding names in the telephone directory because of their lack of familiarity with the alphabet. Many of our youngsters are rusty on the sequence of the letters of the alphabet.

Now we have the confusion of youth complicated by the difficulties of the older generations. In the midst of this alphabetical uncertainty in the schoolrooms, along come Tugwell, Hopkins, and Ickes with 57 variations of alphabetical readjustment. Out of this maze of letters come the familiar symbols "W. P. A." and "P. W. A." As a new Congressman I am not embarrassed to admit that I was quite unacquainted with the fine distinctions connected with the order of arrangement of these mystical letters. I knew that regardless of the order of arrangement they emanated from the bureaucratic satellites of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And I was, and still am, of the opinion that any political reaction that may accrue because of the activities of any division of the governmental program will affect Mr. Roosevelt and his chances for reelection. The average voter, like your new Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of Michigan, will be hazy in his distinction between P. W. A. and W. P. A. And if the management or administration of either department produces what may be fairly designated as "malfeasance" or "misfeasance", the reaction will be against the Democratic ticket in November. And no one will stop to consider whether Mr. Ickes is the Simon-pure nonpartisan, or whether Mr. Hopkins is to be the scapegoat for all the partisan patronage that is being dispensed under the cloak of human relief.

It is probably true that P. W. A. had nothing to do with the circumstances occurring in my district in the months of November, December, and January, on which my remarks were based and for that reason I retract the reference to P. W. A. in my speech of January 14, page 399, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and ask to have, "and P. W. A." stricken from the permanent record.

Mr. Chairman, when this Committee rises it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected in that respect.

As a matter of fact there were five or six projects just getting under way in my district in November, December, and January under the auspices of the P. W. A. and I am only too glad to state that the methods of administration in those particular cases appeal to me as infinitely superior to the methods adopted by W. P. A.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the opportunity of pointing out the very obvious fact that from the very nature of the circumstances, so long as the abbreviations, P. W. A. and W. P. A. are used, there will continue to be confusion and uncertainty as to the history, background, and responsible governmental agency connected with a given project.

The newspapers supply ample proof that there is much confusion as to whether the \$25,000 municipal dog kennel at Memphis is a W. P. A. or a P. W. A. project. I understand that this particular dog house is a public building but perhaps that does not bring it under Public Works Administration, and I am of the opinion that that particular project might better be designated as a W. A. P. project. And it might even be advisable to insert the letter "S" and make it W. A. S. P., as I am quite sure somebody is going to get "stung" as a result of that item of public works.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What kind of a house did the gentleman refer to?

Mr. MAIN. A dog house.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it really true that such a house has been built?

Mr. MAIN. Yes; at a cost of \$25,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman used the initials "W. A. P."

Mr. MAIN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would call that "wash all pups."

Mr. MAIN. I thank the gentleman. That is a very practical suggestion.

While I am perfectly willing to smooth the ruffled feelings of Secretary Ickes by asking to have the reference to P. W. A. withdrawn from my speech of January 14, I cannot refrain from reminding our Democratic colleagues that the President has a curious assortment of advisers and coworkers. Of course, we cannot blame Mr. Ickes for being anxious to see that his Department is absolved from all criticism. But the fact remains that the Democratic candidate in November will be Franklin Roosevelt and not Harold Ickes, and if there has been misfeasance and malfeasance in scattering the spending power of this Nation broadcast across the land, regardless of the alphabetical sponsorship under which such program is carried on, it will be the Democratic Party that must suffer the consequences.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. I wonder if the gentleman read the returns from California?

Mr. MAIN. I read the returns from California; yes. If the gentleman gets any particular consolation out of those returns, he is welcome to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. For the benefit of the gentleman I think there were 25,000 McGroarty-Townsend votes in California.

Mr. MAIN. Now, if the gentleman is interested in Townsend votes, I would like to know why his Townsend investigating committee is acting like the pup that I used to know about that was always chasing the cat, but he always regulated his speed so that he never quite caught up with the cat. Why this 2 weeks' postponement in completing the examination of Dr. Townsend?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I insist on order among the Republicans.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the gentleman from Michigan, I think the RECORD should show that Mr. HOFFMAN is not responsible for the 2 weeks' adjournment, and that that should be laid at the door of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I am devoting these remarks to Mr. Ickes and not to Mr. HOFFMAN. [Laughter and applause.]

So far as I am concerned, the Honorable Mr. Ickes and his Department are relieved of any and all charges of misfeasance and malfeasance or discrimination in the selection of employables on projects in the Third District of Michigan during the months of November, December, and January last. But let it also be said that the wise and judicious spending of certain millions from the Federal Treasury under the banner of P. W. A. will not eclipse or justify the unwise squandering of other millions from the Federal Treasury, regardless of the manner in which the alphabet is juggled. It is difficult for the people of my district to comprehend any good reason for failing to approve the proposed addition to the school building in the township of Comstock, Kalamazoo County, costing less than \$50,000, with the local contribution in cash ready for use, while Federal money was being spent in providing shower baths for stray dogs in the city of Memphis. The fact that Mr. Roosevelt is following the suggestions of Harry Hopkins, instead of accepting the counsel of Harold Ickes, will not satisfy the school children of Comstock who are denied the benefits of a gymnasium, even though the homeless hounds of Memphis are bedded down in sanitary kennels.

Mr. Roosevelt may be well pleased with the personnel of his official advisers, but in my opinion his administration will come to an abrupt end because of his indiscriminate and flagrant disregard for the laws of party tradition. The

performance of the party in power appears to have followed the platform of the Socialist Party for 1932 instead of the Democratic platform adopted in Chicago 4 years ago. The appointees and responsible advisers of the President lack regularity in their political ancestry and in their political outlook. Some of their program seems to bear the stamp of foreign origin. Like the Government mule, who, because of too flagrant violation of the laws of animal husbandry, can have neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity, so some of the political cross-breeds in the Roosevelt administration family suggest some unholy alliance of the Democratic donkey with one of the nightmare delusions from Russia. Hybrid advocates of political experimentation, like the mule, may be tough and hardy while they last, but can boast neither of political ancestry nor can they have reasonable hope for political posterity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAIN], who just had the floor, as to the reason for the adjournment of the investigating committee, of course, as the gentleman well knows, I do not know why an adjournment was had, because I am only one member of a committee of eight, and, unlike the gentleman who just preceded me, I do not assume to know all that the others know, and I do not assume to speak for anyone but myself. However, I have learned somewhat indirectly that the adjournment was had to enable counsel for the committee to have here in Washington some of the information which they have obtained in California, so that they might accurately quote documents which were put in evidence there.

Personally, I am somewhat hasty, somewhat abrupt at times, and somewhat inclined to form quick conclusions. But I can say to the gentleman that from the day that committee first met it was my understanding that they were to meet and question Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements on the following Friday, and I have been willing and am now as a member of that committee to go through with that examination. I did learn while up in the gentleman's district last week that it was being represented up there to the voters, to those who were asked to contribute their dimes and quarters, that if they would pay, not \$1.20, because the district manager said he did not put forth that statement, but that if people would contribute \$1.45 a year to the Townsend organization, which claims credit for the gentleman's election, there would be paid to everyone eligible a \$2,400 annuity each year, or \$200 a month.

Let me quote from the instructions to all area managers under the jurisdiction of the central regional office at Chicago.

If every member will pay his or her 10-cent quota promptly each month during 1936, and we win the next Congress, that means the 12 monthly quotas plus the 25 cents membership fee, a total of \$1.45, is all it costs to win an annuity of \$2,400 a year—\$200 per month and assured employment at living wages for every worker. Do you know of any investment anywhere that will yield such value that costs so little? No matter what any club member's circumstances may be, it would seem the part of wisdom to make a real sacrifice to pay this small monthly quota of 10 cents. It is the lifeblood of your organization; it is practically all we have to use in the fight against the powerful and abundantly financed groups and individuals who are spending so freely to defeat our purpose. Please, please, get this thought before every Townsend club in your area, because we are falling behind other regions in meeting our club quotas.

Now, if it takes a little bit of time to demonstrate that that has been the course the country over, that the people have been deceived, that they have been defrauded out of their dimes and quarters, that they are to be induced to vote for someone as a candidate for Congress upon his promise that if they would give their \$1.45 a year and elect him that he in return would assist in enacting legislation which would give this annuity of \$2,400, I think the adjournment is a good thing, because it is well they should know

that not only in Michigan but everywhere such promises have been put forth.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAIN. I wonder if the gentleman found out that a statement over my signature stating my platform in that campaign contained the announcement that I would vote for the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, and that was the limit of my statement with regard to promises as to Townsend-plan legislation? I am glad to stand by that promise when and if the opportunity comes to vote on that bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not inquire as to the gentleman's platform, because it was in the papers at the time of the campaign. I did not, I do not, consider the gentleman's platform conclusive on this matter. As these questions were asked of different witnesses they informed me—they volunteered the information—that the gentleman from Michigan was the standard bearer, being the first man in Congress, the first congressional candidate who had been elected by them, by the Townsend organization; and I learned that he, the gentleman from Michigan, had appeared on the platform with Dr. Townsend or Mr. Clements and with Townsend speakers during the campaign. I know also, from all the Townsend publications, the Townsend plan as set forth, for instance, in this month's issue of their paper that they, the Townsend organization, stand without compromise for \$200 a month; and we know there is no such bill before this Congress at the present time. I know also that the McGroarty bill, according to the testimony of the man who was called as an expert by Dr. Townsend—I refer to Dr. Robert R. Doane—will not produce more than \$33.33 per month, and he finally testified under oath that if the amount raised by the McGroarty bill was distributed among 10,000,000 pensioners it would give approximately \$30 per month. These figures do not allow for any administrative costs, which, of course, would make a material reduction in the amount actually received by the pensioner.

He concluded his testimony on this subject with the statement that the pension which would be received under the McGroarty bill would purchase about \$6 worth "of our present goods."

The doctor further testified that the Michigan pension law, as it now exists, would produce more in actual purchasing value to the pensioners than would the pension under the McGroarty bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of appropriating \$1,500,000,000 for work relief, as provided in this measure, largely because a great deal of the money will be used in the so-called boondoggling program; and I will state my reasons: In the so-called boondoggling program the money has been spent on what type of person? On the white-collar individual. What does he comprise? He comprises a class of persons whom it would be impossible to utilize in any kind of a P. W. A. project because of the fact that they have had no training or experience with manual labor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Is that the reason they lean on their shovels instead of using them to raise material?

Mr. FORD of California. Possibly so; but they do not do that. You see, I am talking about the white-collar people. Who are they? They are artists, singers, musicians, actors, dancers, school teachers, and persons engaged in all the finer forms of artistic endeavor. Of course, if we do not want to help the artist who has no work, we can take him out, as some of the opponents of this bill would do, and shoot him. How about the vocal artist? We would still the singer's voice; we would numb the harpist's fingers; we would leave those whose gifts are along artistic and cultural lines to starve, freeze, and go naked?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. FORD of California. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. These musicians and artists must live like other citizens; they should have an American standard of living.

Mr. FORD of California. Absolutely.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I can see no reason for not helping them. I think the administration deserves credit for doing something for them.

Mr. FORD of California. The distinguished gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution. He, of course, has a great heart, like all his progressive neighbors, and he believes in things that have for their purpose the bettering of human beings.

The gentlemen who are so much opposed to these boondoggling projects—who are they? They are the gentlemen who sit in palatial offices, who have a dozen secretaries at their command; they are the gentlemen who control the destinies of the railroads, the banks, and the great industrial corporations, and all the rest of it. They would leave the artists, the musicians, the singers, the dancers, and all that great mass of people whose aims and ambitions are concerned with the finer, the higher, the more artistic things of life—they would leave them out, they would leave out the school teacher who is unemployed to starve, the dancing teacher and any other class of people whose activities and training and background and experience disqualify them for the pick or the shovel or the maul or any other implement that is used in manual labor. That is what I like about Harry Hopkins.

Harry Hopkins has a broad comprehension of human needs, which is not confined to any one single class. He has done a courageous and splendid job.

Mr. Chairman, I would vote for adding another \$700,000,000 for W. P. A., but I shall not vote to take \$700,000,000 from the present appropriation. I am opposed to that from the start, and I am going to fight it with all the strength and ability I have at my command, because I want this money to use for the creation of jobs that may be started quickly and which will put the maximum number of people to work for the maximum length of time. It is beyond my understanding how Members of this House can oppose the use of this money for the type of project contemplated by the Works Progress Administration. In doing so they are unconsciously joining with the interests that oppose everything and would adopt a do-nothing policy.

The "old guard" reactionary opposition to the New Deal has been one of attack, with the only alternative a return to *laissez faire*. Nothing constructive, nothing that squarely faces the spectacle of poverty in the midst of plenty, of unemployment, while industrial profits mount, of the sweatshop and the slum, of child labor and the destitute aged, has come from the reactionary leadership which controls the G. O. P. But now, at last, the Republican National Committee has realized that some alternative plan must be offered, if the ever-growing tide in favor of the New Deal is to be stemmed.

Hence we read of the Republican "brain trust", headed by Dr. Thomas Nixon Carver, professor emeritus of political economy, Harvard University. Dr. Carver is noted as a dry-as-dust economist of the old school, who interprets political economy in terms of capital, wages, profits, supply and demand, and who excludes all reference to human welfare, to widening opportunity for all the people, to methods of securing a higher standard of living for the multitude. He, of course, is opposed to W. P. A.

For the Republican National Committee Dr. Carver has evolved a plan, which for cold-blooded calculation, for gross materialism, for a repudiation of every principle of democracy, cannot be matched in the known world.

Here it is, as given in the press:

1. Easing or elimination of Government regulation and restraint on business.

2. Reduction of the supply of labor by sterilization of the "palpably unfit"; widespread use of birth control; exclusion of all immigration; checks on marriage. Marriage would be barred until the parties could afford to buy and operate an automobile.

3. Organization of the "substantial people of America" in a national party to stamp out radicalism.

4. Curtailment of unemployment relief by forcing idle off rolls by "severe regulations."

The central idea of this plan is to reduce as rapidly as possible the supply of labor, looked upon not as human beings, but as instruments to create profits for the substantial people of America, who are to unite to stamp out what the pundits choose to brand as radicalism. America is thus envisioned as a closed corporation, owned and controlled by the capitalistic few, and conducted as a great industrial and business organization, producing enormous incomes for those in control. All who dare to oppose such an order, once it is established on what was once free America, are to be dealt with as radicals. There is no thought of so adjusting our almost unlimited power of production as to enable all our people to enjoy an increasingly high standard of living; there is no recognition of the fact that this is an age of plenty and that it is only a complete failure in distribution that makes want and privation, lack of opportunity, unrest, and despair rampant.

There is in Dr. Carver's document this pregnant sentence: "Possibly Mussolini and Hitler are more farseeing than the rest of us." Certainly Hitler is, if by this we mean that he is succeeding in regimenting the German people, in depriving them of the freedom of speech and of the press, of a free parliament elected by the people, of the right to worship according to their convictions, of justice under the law, regardless of race or creed or political opinion. All these sacred rights, which we Americans cherish as we do our own souls, Hitler has taken from the German people. And to this a respected professor from a university that has long stood for American ideals gives his implied approval.

I do not believe that Republicans generally approve such doctrine. It is only that small group of reactionaries, backed by limitless money, who accept these Fascist theories, who advocate such an un-American and un-Christian plan as Dr. Carver's. The rank and file of the Republican voters will repudiate it, along with all the other free-minded Americans who still insist that the welfare clause of the Constitution means precisely what it says, and that America was meant to be, and shall continue to be, the land of opportunity for the great common people, whether they be artists, musicians, actors, or writers, and not a bonanza for the money grabber.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I made earlier in the day and to insert a few brief abstracts from the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1936, which is presented here, I shall support in its entirety. There are, however, some phases of the bill with which I am not in entire agreement, and therefore I should like to make certain suggestions to the Committee with reference to modifications and changes.

Insofar as the W. P. A. is concerned, this agency of the Government presents certain definite problems which affect the Members of this House coming from various districts throughout the Nation. This is particularly true and applicable as far as the big cities are concerned, where larger W. P. A. projects are necessary. Where the unemployment problem is large it is natural that the individual project should be large. I have in mind, for example, an artillery armory in my district. The War Department is very anxious to locate a motorized unit in the city of Detroit because it is the heart of the automobile industry. The University of Detroit has a very fine engineering school with a campus that is very attractive for this purpose, but the W. P. A. does not seem to be able to decide on going through with the project.

In the first instance, when the application was made, the ruling of Mr. Hopkins was that the per-man-unit costs were too high. These were later restudied and reduced to conform with the general outlined requirements of the Department. Then the ruling was made that because of the size of the project it could not be finished before July 1 and, accordingly, was definitely disapproved.

The Members of the House know that the W. P. A., and P. W. A. for that matter, will not cease at the expiration of the month of June. We know that unemployment at least to a certain extent will still be with us. I fail to see why a worthy conforming project of the kind I just mentioned in a large community, such as I represent, cannot be given approval and a continuing cash allowance made for its commencement, with further allowances until it is finally completed, instead of saying: "Since we cannot start and finish the project before July 1, it must be disapproved and rejected." We know that small armories of \$60,000, \$70,000, and \$80,000 have been and are still being built in the smaller communities and smaller cities and towns. A small project of that kind in my district would be absolutely worthless and could not be considered. It is absolutely essential in a community where the unemployment problem is greater to have a project correspondingly larger. The only way to solve that sort of problem is to have a continuing appropriation. I shall expect appropriate remedies to be incorporated in this bill before the final vote upon adoption.

Another phase of the first deficiency appropriation bill I should like to discuss has to do with the salary increases for deputy United States marshals. Here is a group of men throughout the Nation that render a splendid service. Some very fine men are connected with the United States marshal's offices throughout the United States. They receive approximately two-thirds of the amount ordinarily paid deputy sheriffs and in many instances less. The only reason the salaries of these people have not been increased commensurate with their service is because they are not an organized group and not in a position to force their demands. The Attorney General states in a written communication to me that he is willing and anxious to have these increases made. Why the Appropriations Committee does not do something about it is a matter I cannot understand. Perhaps the committee spokesman will tell me and the Members of the House that the Bureau of the Budget refuses to make the recommendation; however, regardless of who is to blame, something should be done to correct the situation. The Attorney General is favorable; Members of this body, upon whom rests the responsibility, know the claim of these faithful employees is just; so let us tell the Director of the Budget what he must do. He is the servant, not the master, of the Congress. I think it is high time that the Appropriations Committee assume its full duty and correct the situation. These men are giving of their best effort in the Government service. They work all hours of the day, serving summons as late as 10 or 11 o'clock at night. When they serve two or three summons in distant cities and towns of a judicial district jurisdiction, they receive but one fee for this additional work. When using their cars they are not even allowed an amount of money for mileage commensurate with the expenditure involved. As a consequence, it is frequently necessary for them to abandon their automobiles and use streetcars. This costs the Government a great deal more in the long run, because a deputy cannot cover enough territory or get service in as many instances as he would if he used his automobile. In other words, where they could make six or seven or more calls by the use of an auto they can only make a half of that number, using streetcars. This is false economy, and the Department of Justice knows this condition exists and is anxious to correct it.

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to refer to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MAIN]. I have heard him spout on this floor about as much as I care to without some reasonable reply. The only thing I now remember of his partisan abusive speeches is the word "wolf", which he used three or four times in every breath. Where and for what purpose

that word came into his speech, I do not know, but I remember it very distinctly. He is still shouting "Wolf" or, rather, perhaps, talking about dog houses down in Kentucky.

Fortunately the gentleman has seen the light. He comes before the committee now and makes a public and abject apology to Mr. Ickes and admits having made a serious mistake in connection with his unfair attack upon the Secretary of the Interior. One thing the gentleman will learn, if he is here long enough, is if he wants to be right, he should pay some attention to what he is talking about. He had not been here long enough to get his feet wet when he started to attack the present administration.

Now, this gentleman came to the House elected as an advocate of the Townsend plan. Two hundred dollars per month and no less. Here he talks for the McGroarty bill, but he fails to make clear to his people the distinct difference between the Townsend plan and the McGroarty bill. He should have done so when my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], stated here that the McGroarty bill is different from that which our people believe is the Townsend plan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. I advocated and worked for adequate old-age pensions long before I ever came to Congress. I have worked with the fraternal order of Eagles and with their national chaplain for adequate pensions. So there is not any question about where I stand regarding pensions. Let me point out the simple difference between the McGroarty bill and the Townsend plan. In dollars and cents it amounts to \$167 per month less per individual pensioner than he expects, or has been led to expect, under the Townsend plan.

It is doubtful if the McGroarty bill could possibly pay over \$33 per month per pensioner.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I cannot yield at the moment, but I will be pleased to yield in a few minutes.

We, the Members from Michigan, regardless of political affiliation, have something to work for. I was led to believe that the Michigan old-age-pension law allowed a maximum for pensioners of \$30 per month. I figured that by adding the Federal allowance of \$15 per month, an aged pensioner could receive a sum of \$45, or \$90 for an aged couple. Now I find that the Michigan law will pay the maximum of \$30, including the Federal allowance. Michigan's law should be amended to pay by itself not less than \$30, to which should be added the allowance from the social security funds.

I will discard all politics and work with any and all Michigan Congressmen for these and other liberalizations in accordance with a plan which I will discuss upon this floor at the first opportunity.

I invite your nonpartisan cooperation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. AMLIE].

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Chairman, according to recent figures put out by the American Federation of Labor, we have had something over 12,000,000 unemployed during the past 5 years and something over 11,000,000 unemployed during the past 6 years. Throughout the country the feeling is growing with the people that the situation we face is a chronic one; that we may expect to see a continuation of this degree of unemployment for an indeterminable period into the future. Here in the House the feeling still persists as it did 4 years ago that this is a temporary depression and that before long prosperity will return, everyone will be given employment, and the necessity for relief will end.

I do not believe there is any justification for this hope, and I believe we should begin to take general notice of the fact that what we are facing today is what we are going to face next year and the year after that.

Since the depression began we have had an increase in output per man-hour in manufacturing, generally conceded

to be in excess of 30 percent. This means we could return to the industrial activity of 1929 and still have eight or ten million people unemployed. As a matter of fact, we could return to that degree of industrial activity and instead of employing the seventeen and a half million workers that were employed at that time, we could turn out the same quantity of manufactured goods with 12,300,000 workers.

If we assume that the technological advance will go on during the next 6 years as it has during the past 6 years, we could then achieve the industrial output of 1929 with only 8,610,000 workers.

This situation, it seems to me, presents a problem that is going to remain with us a long time. These 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 people are unemployed today, and they are going to be unemployed indefinitely into the future, even though we have a return to the industrial activity of 1929. As a matter of fact, last December, January, and February we had achieved substantially the normal industrial activity that prevailed during the years 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926.

So, in a sense, prosperity has returned, but we still continue to have 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 people unemployed.

Prosperity has returned from another standpoint. Not long ago, a financial writer, John T. Flynn, gave the figures of profits covering some 388 corporations.

During the first 6 months of 1933 these corporations earned \$77,000,000.

During the first 6 months of 1934 they earned \$380,000,000.

During the first 6 months of 1935 they earned \$435,000,000.

I have a brother-in-law who returned recently after spending a year in England, and he tells me that the economists he met there were all talking about one thing, and that was the great American boom.

These economists are perfectly right. We are in this country having a boom through increased industrial activity and increased profits; and, as a result, the securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange have increased from \$32,000,000,000 to \$51,000,000,000 in the course of a year and a half.

But we still have 12,000,000 people unemployed at the present time, and barring another world war, these people are going to remain unemployed. It seems to me high time that the Congress of the United States, both parties represented here—the two major parties—ought to recognize that this unemployment will remain with us indefinitely into the future.

I recall the first session of the Seventy-second Congress. We had up to that time proceeded on the theory that if we let nature take its course, eventually we would snap out of the depression.

The philosophy was abandoned when we enacted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law. Those of you who were here at that time remember the tremendous amount of pressure that was brought to bear by the business interests, who were unwilling, apparently, to take the same medicine which they had insisted upon for the unemployed, when they realized that the deflationary process was injuring them also. Under President Hoover the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loaned almost \$3,000,000,000 to bail out "busted" bankers and businessmen.

The election of 1932 gave the answer of the American people to the effect that they did not intend to work out of the depression by following the policy of deflation to its logical conclusion.

Under Mr. Roosevelt we have abandoned the idea that we can work out of the depression by following a deflationary course. Outside of a few responsible men like Senator CARTER GLASS and H. Parker Willis, I really cannot think of anyone who at that time believed that we could go on with a program of deflation.

Since the decision was made, made with the agreement of a great majority of the American people, to embark on a program of spending, it seems to me the thing to consider is how can we spend money. The Government could, for instance, have gone ahead and built permanent buildings of one kind and another, such as is proposed by the Public

Works Administration, but this kind of program of course encountered objection by business for the reason that every expenditure for permanent buildings today adds to the tax load in the future in the form of maintenance expense for those buildings. Probably 10 or 20 percent of the money expended now would be reflected in permanent carrying charges each year in the future. For that reason we find business quite generally opposed to permanent expenditures of this kind.

There is another thing which I have advocated and which I believe should be done. In February a year and a half ago, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the figures from the F. E. R. A., showing the cost of giving relief on various bases. In December 1934, it cost \$165,000,000 a month to take care of the unemployed, with 42 percent of the people at made work. That was the figure of the F. E. R. A., that if we would but do away with made work and put people on the straight dole, which has now become the Republican program, the same kind of relief could be given for \$130,000,000 a month; or if we were to do away with retail purchasing and buy everything on a wholesale basis and distribute it to the unemployed through a commissary system, it could be done for \$92,000,000 a month, but if the unemployed were to be given the opportunity to go to work supplying their own needs, the figures of the F. E. R. A. indicated that they could then be given the same standard of living for \$60,000,000 a month, that now costs \$165,000,000 a month. This report went on to say that if that amount were increased from \$60,000,000 a month to \$78,000,000 a month, it would be possible to increase the living standard of the people on relief by 35 to 40 percent, bringing people on relief a higher standard of living than that normally enjoyed by people employed in industry.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMLIE. Yes.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman made some reference to the Republican policy, which of course is not admitted or supported by the Republican organization, but I ask the gentleman if he believes that the policies and remedies of the Democratic Party of free trade, low tariff, or reciprocal tariffs will serve to employ these ten or twelve million people who are unemployed.

Mr. AMLIE. I do not believe it is possible to reduce tariffs during a period of economic retraction, regardless of what my viewpoint might be in time of prosperity. I think we are all agreed that it is impossible in times like these to do any such thing.

Mr. THURSTON. Then the gentleman is in favor of tariffs in distressed times, but not in fair weather?

Mr. AMLIE. I would want to take more time than we have now to answer such a question, but it is impossible to reduce tariffs in times like these, regardless of what my philosophy might have been 20 years ago under different circumstances.

The figures I have given were also put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator Bronson Cutting shortly before he died; in the form of a letter written by Jacob Baker, Assistant Relief Administrator.

But when the proposal is made to put the unemployed to work, business immediately objects upon the ground that it is interfering with business. The point I make is that if we can give people on relief the same standard of living for \$60,000,000 that is costing \$165,000,000 a month, then let us be frank and recognize that at least \$105,000,000 a month is a dole to business and not to the unemployed. I am willing to defend the proposition that of the money that has been spent up to this time either as charity expenditures or in the form of loans of one kind and another, aggregating almost \$20,000,000,000—some has been repaid—the great bulk of that has gone as a dole to business and not to the unemployed. Business has gotten more out of this administration than the unemployed; and if people here are really sincere in saying that boondoggling demoralizes the unemployed—and I am inclined to agree with them—none of us would get any satisfaction in going out and doing with a

pick and shovel what we know could be done for one-tenth of the cost with a steam shovel; still, if we really believe these people are willing to work, why not give them this opportunity to contribute their own labor toward their own support? I am sure the unemployed would get great satisfaction out of that, and we could reduce the amount of relief expenditures by more than half. In the meantime I think we should also recognize that most of this money is going as a dole to business and is not going as a dole to the unemployed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMLIE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Beside the benefit that business is getting as a dole, would the gentleman make some observation as to the standards of living on which the unemployed are maintained today?

Mr. AMLIE. I can give a statement by Dr. Walter R. Campbell, of the department of medicine of the University of Toronto, at the American Medical Association convention at Atlantic City last year, in which he said:

Twenty-five million of the unemployed in Canada and the United States are in danger of becoming unemployable by eating a relief diet too high in carbohydrates and too low in proteins for reasons of economy. Much emphasis has been placed on the economy of starch calories as opposed to fat calories, which are relatively expensive. Unemployment diets are tending to run high in carbohydrates. . . . The apparently inevitable degradation from unemployment to unemployable should not be accelerated by a falsely economical provision of foodstuffs.

I notice in the gentleman's own city last fall there was a report by Dr. Smith, assistant director of health education, stating that lack of sufficient food had wasted bodies and sapped the mental vigor of more than a hundred thousand school children until they can no longer keep up with their better-fed classmates in school work. In the elementary schools on Manhattan Island there are 125,000 seriously undernourished youngsters.

Incidentally I might say that the percentage of sickness among people on relief ranges anywhere from 25 to 60 percent higher than among people who are not on relief. So it is only too apparent that people are not getting enough to maintain their health.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. AMLIE] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. AMLIE. Because business objects to the spending of money for permanent public works, and objects to spending money for permitting the unemployed to contribute their own labor toward their own support, there remain only two possible alternatives, and they are the dole on the one hand and boondoggling on the other. I think it is a disgrace in the year 1936 if the American people are going to be given the opportunity merely to choose between those two alternatives represented by the Republican Party and the dole on the one hand and the Democratic Party and boondoggling on the other. As a choice between those two evils, and that is apparently the choice, I want to say that under the old deal the average relief was only \$8 a month per family. By October 1933 it had gone up to \$17.22. In January 1935 it had reached a high of \$30.30. Then it began to slip. In September 1935 it was back to \$25.90. Under the W. P. A. approximately three and one-half million people last year, during the current year, were working at \$50 a month. A million and a half more could have qualified, but the appropriation was not sufficient to take care of them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a suggestion to the Committee on Appropriations. This bill was reported today. I hold in my hand the hearings covering 2,000 pages and more. The bill itself contains over 100 pages. There is much information in these hearings. We are sitting as a jury, presumed to decide a case, and the evidence is found in 2,000 printed pages which was not avail-

able—not obtainable by a single member of the jury—until we commenced consideration.

We talk about debate, and much is said about debate not being confined to the bill. Who is going to be able to talk about what is in these 2,000 printed pages when he has had no opportunity to know what the evidence is? It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations, which follows this custom continuously, should change the custom. In other words, a bill is brought in appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars, yet the facts which are known only to that committee, cannot be obtained by a Member of the House who must pass upon the bill before we vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. It does seem to me that common sense would dictate that if Congress is to render anything approaching deliberate judgment, it should at least be given the evidence in printed form, possibly 24 hours, in any event, before they begin consideration. It may be said, of course, that we will have time to read the hearings before we vote, but it is a physical impossibility to read the hearings and remain on the floor. In other words, if a Member of the House took the hearings which were delivered to us at the very hour when this bill was called up for consideration, and retired to his room and read all day and all night continuously, he might have digested, in a general way, this information.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not understand just what the gentleman's complaint is. What are we doing that the gentleman thinks we should not do?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not think you should bring a bill of this importance before the Congress without any information available to the Congress. The rules of the House and the custom of the House contemplate that the committee in charge shall hold hearings. Those hearings are printed for a purpose, and the purpose is that the House may read them and know what they are going to be asked to vote upon. The hearings are printed to be used by the House in reaching a conclusion and not to be filed away on a shelf.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman knows the bill is here by the unanimous consent of the House?

Mr. MICHENER. That is another thing. The bill is here by unanimous consent of the House. We did an unusual thing today. The chairman of the committee did a very unusual thing. He asked that all points of order be waived. When I had the temerity to suggest it was unusual, I was advised that the majority had the power, that you had the Rules Committee upstairs, and that if we did not consent to the unanimous-consent request, you would use the Rules Committee, you would use the power, and you would do it anyway. Therefore, any consideration asked for would only mean delay. Of course, not wanting to delay, I withdrew my objection, and we are here by unanimous consent.

We have a bill here that has many things in it which violate the rules of the House and we are estopped from raising points of order because we consented not to raise them under a threat of the use of power if we did not consent.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is no different from what the custom has always been. The gentleman knows the bill is here in the regular course that every appropriation bill has been introduced here for years.

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman should recall this fact—

Mr. MICHENER. I cannot yield to the gentleman, for I have such limited time.

Mr. WOODRUM. I will yield the gentleman some time if he wants more. The gentleman has colleagues on the Appropriations Committee—and we all rely on our colleagues—who are distinguished, able, vigorous, and active gentlemen. They are entirely satisfied with what is being done. It seems to me the gentleman's complaint is rather farfetched.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not agree that the distinguished, able—I forget the other adjectives the gentleman applied to the minority members of the committee—are entirely satisfied. If they are entirely satisfied, then I think it is time the House assert itself.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman know how many millions of dollars are involved in this bill?

Mr. MICHENER. No; I cannot say; and I would like to ask the chairman of this committee why it is no bills are available. Since 12:30 this afternoon, 1 hour after the House convened its session, I tried to get a copy of the bill, the bill I am to be asked to vote on and that all Members are to be asked to vote on. It is not obtainable now and has not been since 12:30 this afternoon. I do not know whether a lesser number than usual was printed—I do not know what became of the bills, but I do know that I have no bill and that other Members have been unable to get copies of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM. Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind that he is going to vote for the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. There is doubt in the gentleman's mind?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I happen to be one of those Members who, as a rule, wants to know what is in a bill before he votes for it. I have just told the gentleman I have not seen the bill. I do not know what is in it. I cannot get a copy of the bill, yet the gentleman asks if there is any doubt that I am going to vote for it.

Mr. WOODRUM. I hand the gentleman a copy of the bill right now.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman; but I do want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a custom has apparently grown up in the House, at least on the majority side, that majority Members are expected to follow these vigilant leaders to whom the gentleman referred; and the gentleman is surprised that I have the boldness to say I have not made up my mind whether I am going to vote for a bill which I do not know anything about. The custom of which I speak has become entirely too common. Too many Members are voting for bills they never read, bills they have no opportunity to read. They follow their distinguished leader, my good friend; and he is a very splendid gentleman, an affable gentleman, a good leader, but I sometimes pity him in the position he is in. At times he blushes, but he goes along; but the time is not far distant when the back of the gentleman will be calloused by the party Whip to such an extent that the sting will not be felt longer and he will again exert himself in the splendid manhood which he heretofore has displayed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman like a little more time?

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I did not get a definite answer to the last inquiry I made of the gentleman from Michigan, namely, whether he knew how many millions were involved in this bill; and if he does not know, can he tell us how we may find out?

Mr. MICHENER. Answering the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would say that I have finally succeeded, through the generosity of the chairman of this committee, in getting a copy of the bill which I hold in my hand.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does it say in it how many millions of dollars are involved?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know. I am going to retire to the cloakroom and look at the bill and find out how much is in it; and I suggest to some of the other gentlemen who have not been able to get a copy of the bill, but who want

to know what is in it, if they will come to me I will lend them this bill so they can find out what they are going to be asked to vote for in a little while.

Mr. TREADWAY. What I want to know from the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Chairman, if he does not know how many millions are involved, whether it is not a fact that more millions are involved than there are Members on the floor at this moment.

Mr. MICHENER. There are about 50 Members here at the moment.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; about 25.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know. Let us say 25 to 50.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield. I would like to look at the gentleman's bill. I have been trying since 12 o'clock to get a copy of it, but have not got one yet.

In conclusion let me remind you of the importance of this measure. It furnishes the money to carry on the social-security program. It provides relief for the destitute and the unemployed for the coming year in addition to the usual deficiency appropriation bill items. Yet as the Members of the House, we are now debating the merits or demerits of this proposed legislation; and yet as Members of the House, we are unable to secure copies of the bill. Of course, intelligent debate cannot be indulged in by any excepting the few members on the Appropriations Committee who are familiar with the facts. This whole practice is wrong, and I for one shall continue to protest against such procedure. There is no legitimate reason why hearings containing the facts, which are the basis for the appropriation, should be withheld from the membership until this late hour. Possibly knowledge of the contents of the hearing will provoke debate. Surely the Members will have more knowledge about the provisions of the bill. The responsibility for this legislation rests on the individual membership, and that membership should not be denied access to all of the facts, even though those facts are available to the committee members.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, in common with the gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, we all realize that in times like this, some provision must be made to care for those within our Nation who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed. We realize that we cannot cut off appropriations to care for those people, and I am sure that very few, if any, of us have any desire to do so. But when I look over this bill, which is called a deficiency appropriation bill, to my mind it is badly deficient with respect to that part of the appropriation which is made in order to provide work for the unemployed. It is sadly deficient in the fundamental principle which should be back of legislation of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize that under present conditions we must provide a public-works program for the relief of our unemployed. During the past 3 years we have been reemploying men at a rapid rate, but labor-saving machinery has been almost as effective in displacing labor as we are at reemploying it. We all agree that we cannot allow our unemployed to go hungry or be in want for clothing or shelter. The dole is unthinkable. We must provide work until industry can absorb our unemployed.

Mistakes are, of course, inevitable. The disgrace in a mistake is making the same one twice. We must not repeat our mistake in W. P. A. We must not make the mistake of allowing this appropriation to go as we did the last one—unearmarked into the hands of a professional spender of other people's money.

Unemployment may be a national problem, but reemployment is a local problem. To solve it requires something more than bureaucratic theory. It requires a practical consideration of the conditions in each locality. Conditions vary so greatly in different localities that no blanket set of administrative rulings can apply effectively. Spring, summer, and fall in a rural community, when farm labor is in demand, offers much more chance of seasonal employment than does

the same season in a city. In order to function effectively and economically a reemployment program must be flexible, otherwise a great deal of money will be spent for useless projects. In my district under the W. P. A. a great deal of money has been unwisely spent which should have been wisely spent. Too much of it has gone to useless projects and the taxpayers are grumbling. They have a right to grumble. Let no one believe that they do not pay their share of taxes, whether they pay them directly or not. Even the W. P. A. worker pays these taxes, and the smaller the income the greater proportion of it goes for taxes.

Gangs of W. P. A. workers were used to scrape down the slopes of the banks along the roads. In many places the sod was taken off the banks above back as far as the fence posts. The hard winter and the rainy spring brought these slopes down onto the berme. The money had been so foolishly spent as to make necessary the spending of more to repair the damage caused. If the program had been elastic enough, this money could have been applied to building roads of native stone, which would have gone a long way toward taking the farmers out of the mud. I venture to say that the money wasted upon useless projects and that which has been paid out in doles in my district would have done away with every dirt road in my district. Then it would not have been wasted and would still have furnished employment.

In another section of my district the Monongahela River is carrying away much valuable land at certain spots. Not far away are cliffs overhanging the road from which rocks fall and menace all traffic. If the W. P. A. program was as flexible, as it should be, these cliffs could be sloped back and the stone taken from them could be used to revet the river banks at those places where the serious erosion is taking place.

The ideal way to provide for relief and reemployment is to do so locally.

Mr. AMLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. AMLIE. In 13 States which cannot raise money this would amount to a death sentence so far as the unemployed are concerned?

Mr. FADDIS. I cannot see why one State cannot raise money the same as other States. The unemployment load is practically the same within States. It is a fact that the constitutions of the States prohibit them from raising money. These States where the constitution does not prohibit them from raising money do raise their share of it. Until we put relief back into the hands of local authorities the problem will never be solved. [Applause.]

If the taxes were imposed locally, the taxpayers would be more conscious that they come from their pockets and would therefore be more vigilant in watching for racketeering and unwise spending. Every taxpayer would then be an inspector. That system under present conditions would be impossible, as there are many communities which could not raise the taxes. The next best system would be to establish a closer contact between the Federal and local administrators. The best method of doing this is to follow the system of P. W. A. Under P. W. A. we are leaving something behind in the way of permanent improvements which improvements will lessen the local tax burden of the future. The P. W. A. has been the most valuable agency of the Government when it comes to aiding real recovery. It has helped to bring back the so-called heavy industries and has assisted in putting men to work in the natural fields of employment. We are trying to get this Nation back to normal times and as soon as possible discard emergency measures. Let us, therefore, do everything possible to get the unemployed back on industrial pay rolls, where they belong and where they wish to be.

I am quite certain that there is no taxpayer in my district who objects to providing for the unemployed. They do, however, object to spending money upon useless projects, where useful ones can be provided. They, as taxpayers, have the right to object to such practices, and I, as their Representative in Congress, have the right to voice their objections. In fact, it is my duty to do so and to fight for correction of

abuses. If I did not do so, I would be false to their trust in me.

This is a nation of representative government, but for years it has been drifting toward a government by bureaucracy. Representatives of the people come to this body and vote taxes to finance the appropriations which they make. The administration of the agencies which handle these appropriations is placed in the hands of bureaucracies over which neither we nor the people have any control. These bureaucracies are not the result of emergency legislation but have been steadily gaining in power for many years. We are held responsible by our constituents for the manner in which this money is spent. It is our responsibility to see that proper restrictions are imposed to insure the wise spending of this money, and if we refuse to shoulder this responsibility, our constituents should defeat us and replace us with those who will do so. [Applause.]

Mistakes will be made, of course, but let them be made by the representatives of the people. The people can talk to their Representatives and through the ballot have a check on them every 2 years. Not even a Representative or a Senator can talk to these arrogant, theoretical, bureaucratic, professional, spenders of other people's money. Drunk with power, they delight in being contemptuous and even insulting toward the duly elected representatives of the people. They are able to prostitute acts of the Congress to their bureaucratic desires and are leading us hell-bent into a bureaucratic dictatorship. If we have no voice in their appointment we have no check upon their actions. We are not legislators but mere writers of checks, with no voice as to the amount.

It is not only our right but our duty to see that, while furnishing employment for the needy, the money shall be expended in a wise manner. It is our duty to throw restrictions around these theoretical bureaucrats. There must be closer contact between Washington and the community in which the money is spent. More responsibility must be placed upon the local administrators.

The administration of the money wrung from the taxpayers must be placed in the hands of men whose training consists of something more than the administration of the affairs of relief agencies for the last 24 years. A man to be qualified to administer relief should have had experience in life which has trained him in the application of practical solutions of the problems of the Nation. To that kind of man, and to that kind only, can we look to to solve our difficulties. These theoretical professional bureaucrats are only interested in bureaucratic expansion and usurpation of more bureaucratic power. They have no notion of solving the problems of the day, because when these problems are solved their bureaucratic power and grandeur is gone.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORR].

Mr. LORR. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who has just spoken, and it takes my mind back to the early days of relief in New York State before the Federal Government attacked the problem. We made appropriations for relief, and we carried on relief by nonpartisan boards. It was not made a political proposition at that time, and we received from the Red Cross flour, clothing, cotton goods, and almost all kinds of food, and with a small amount of money we were able to take care of our people very well.

When the Democrats came into power they plowed under the wheat, plowed under the cotton, and the people go hungry, or we have to borrow from the Government to take care of them.

To my mind it would have been much better if we had continued to raise wheat and cotton and had taken care of our poor people and not left them starving and cold. I believe now the Government should turn over to the States grants or allotments and let the States administer relief on a nonpartisan basis and carry on the work as we did before the Government took hold of it.

After the Government came in to take care of relief the expense was greater. In some instances as much as 50 percent went for administration. Up in my district they distributed seed potatoes in a country where every farmer had more potatoes than he needed. They brought into one village 400 cases of condensed milk where there were two condenseries right in sight of the place where they unloaded the milk. We also had a Democratic candidate for sheriff, who lost out in election, and they made him the head of the distribution of these foods. They are now paying around \$2,500 a year to distribute these commodities that come from the Government, which we had distributed for nothing. I hope we may get away from this political angle and take care of these projects by local nonpartisan committees and that we may have flour distributed by the Red Cross for our people to use and that we may have clothing distributed by the Red Cross. It was always done efficiently then and without expense to the people. The partisan distribution has not been efficient or satisfactory.

Mr. GOODWIN. How about pork?

Mr. LORD. The pigs and sows were destroyed, so we cannot distribute pork any more.

A few days ago I was up in my district and I visited one of our silk mills. The man who is running that mill I have known for some time and he told me he was going out of business in about 4 days. I asked him what the trouble was and he said:

I am the last of a number of silk mills in the city of Binghamton to go out of business, and the N. R. A. is what put me out of business. We were doing a good business up until the time when the N. R. A. came into vogue and then we raised our prices according to the N. R. A. schedule. Our customers took the orders we had on hand, but when it came to renewing them or reordering from us, we could not get such orders, because they said, "Your price is too high", and they looked elsewhere for the products.

So all of the mills in this one city have gone out of business and many more have gone out of business at other points throughout my district. The President demands that industry put more to work and then hampers and drives business to the wall with legislation like the tax bill that was just passed.

While over in Japan this past fall I visited the textile mills there and I think I found out somewhat the reason for our textile factories going out of business. Over there they work eight and a half hours a day with two shifts a day in these mills. Where they work only one shift, they work ten and a half hours. They work every day in the week, not stopping for Sunday. The wages of the girls who work in these factories amount to about 15 cents a day in our money, or about 50 cents in their money. If our girls were paid 50 cents a day for 8½ hours, it would about compare with their wages. The highest-priced man in these factories receive a yen and a half a day, which would amount to about 45 cents in our money, or \$1.50 in our mills. So when they bring this product to this country, as they are doing, we have to compete with these prices, which we are not able to do. They are just flooding the country with their goods and as time goes on we will keep selling less of our goods.

I know there is great agitation in this country for a shorter work week of 30 hours. To my mind if we should establish a 30-hour week, we would be just that much worse off and our customers would buy more and more from Japan. Their business will go along better and we will have less people at work than we have at the present time, the higher prices are, the less people will buy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LORD. In a moment.

Every time we increase the cost of an article, that article does not meet with as great a demand and there is not as much of it sold. This is the case with silks and with other textiles that come from that country.

I met a buyer for one of the large dry goods stores and he told me that they keep buyers in Japan all the time purchasing for their stores in this country, and that they could buy over there and pay the tariff and get the articles for very much less than they can buy similar goods in this country.

I am for relieving the workingmen in our Nation, but we cannot do it by shortening the hours of labor, so long as Japan and other countries paying much less wages and working nearly twice as many hours have almost free access to our markets.

In Japan everybody works, everybody is doing something. The wages are very small and we do not want our workers to come down to their level of wages; but unless we give business more than a breathing spell, textile industries will continue to go out of business and we will have more and more unemployed.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LORD. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Would the gentleman advocate some degree of greater protection against these imports? I think we should protect American industry, the American workmen against the bringing in of such a flood of imports.

Mr. LORD. The only way that I can see that we can protect American industry is by some tariff law high enough to make up the difference in wages between the countries. We have got to give our workers more protection, not shorter hours. Shorter hours increase prices. If we increase the cost of an article, we lose that much business for the trade goes to where the prices are most favorable. For the good of our workers, we should protect our own markets.

Japan is supplying us at the present time. It is only 3 or 4 years that we have been getting so large a production from that country, and it is, to a great extent, on account of the difference in exchange and living conditions.

The reciprocal agreement with Canada is affecting the farmers of this country adversely and especially the dairy farmer.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I want to say to the gentleman that I opposed the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. LORD. I realize that the gentleman opposed it. I think all of my party are opposed to it, and all those who have the welfare of the dairy farmer at heart. Reciprocal agreements that President Roosevelt has made with Canada, on dairy products, applies alike to all countries and is ruining our farmers. If we could have protection from a country like Japan, especially the manufacturers, we could protect our industry and until such time as we give protection to the farmers and manufacturers we are going to continue to lose business and will have more unemployed on the relief rolls. [Applause.]

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, three incidents closely allied in a program whose purpose is practically identical, and of menacing importance to the people, occurred in Washington today.

FIRST EPISODE

Early this morning people who were awake found the red Soviet communistic flag of Russia floating over their Supreme Court Building just across the grounds from the Nation's Capitol. Of that the Washington Evening Star says:

The red flag of Communist Russia threw its lurid reflection over America's Capital this morning as the rosy-fingered dawn tinted the eastern skies, but a swift marshaling of all the orderly processes of American Government repulsed the threatened upheaval.

The unfurling, in explanation, occurred on the 80-foot mast of the new Supreme Court Building sometime between 4 and 4:30 a. m. Discovery of this subversive attempt to undermine our great Democracy came as an inquisitive sun peeped over the horizon and inquisitive newsmen responded to a mysterious telephone query as to why the emblem of the hammer and sickle should be casting its benediction over the sacred home of the Nation's highest tribunal.

Decisive action followed and, after some tall climbing by a fireman armed with a blow torch, the flag went up in smoke and the Republic was returned to a sound basis.

Capitol Police examined a copy of the Harvard Lampoon discovered at the base of the flagpole. In the magazine, in addition to a few jibes at Yale and Princeton, was an article entitled "Down With Capitalism."

Discovery of the emblem raised a real problem as building guards found the halyards so skillfully and completely knotted that they resisted all attempts at disentanglement. As in most emergencies

of an unusual nature, reliance was placed in the fire department—and not in vain.

A careful investigation is under way, the captain said, in hopes of apprehending ringleaders of the "revolution."

That was one occurrence. That was the way Communists had of showing their contempt for law and orderly government.

SECOND EPISODE

Then the House met at noon, and shortly thereafter there was introduced a report of what is called the Sisson bill, which now is much better known as the "sissy" bill to repeal the law that prevents communism from being indoctrinated in our public schools, which Communists call the "red rider." I want you to read that report. There are more misstatements in it than otherwise. One gross misstatement in it is the assertion that the House and Senate conferees put the "red rider" in the bill in conference. Everyone who knows about legislation or about parliamentary rules and procedure know that that is untrue. That so-called "red rider" never went into the bill until the House itself on this floor by a unanimous vote voted it into the bill, after it had been offered from the floor by Chairman CANNON, and read by the clerk, and until the Senate by a unanimous vote voted it in the bill, after it had been offered from the Senate floor by Senator THOMAS, and read by the Senate clerk, and then voted into the bill by the unanimous vote of the Senate. The conferees had no right to put it in, because it was legislation, and did not put it into the bill. It had to be put in from the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate by the House and the Senate, which was done both by the House and the Senate.

That is the second occurrence. How did the Communists know that the "sissy" bill would be reported today? I did not know it. The Speaker did not know it. It could have been reported any day during the past 20 days.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a minute, if I have time. I want to show you that Communists in New York knew that the "sissy" bill would be reported today, so that you may realize just how closely allied these matters are that are happening here today.

THIRD EPISODE

Here is a mimeographed document that just reached Washington, just came here a few minutes ago, from New York City, and it is not for release until tomorrow in the press. It is "for release Friday, May 8, 1936." It is issued by "The American Civil Liberties Union, of 31 Union Square West, New York City, Roger N. Baldwin, director", at the top, and it is for the press to put in their papers tomorrow.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate is to be confined to the bill and the gentleman is not confining himself to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from New York ought not to be so critical. I have allowed the gentleman on several occasions to speak out of order whenever he desired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I believe in free speech, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I knew the gentleman would, because free speech is one of the main things for which he stands. I will quote from this "red" document, mimeographed in New York by Roger N. Baldwin's "red" organization, and sent here to go in the newspapers tomorrow. Listen to this:

SUPPORT FOR REPEAL OF THE "RED RIDER" URGED

All organizations and individuals interested in education were urged last week by the academic freedom committee of the American Civil Liberties Union through its secretary, Ellen Donohue, to write at once to the Speaker of the House, JOSEPH W. BYRNS, urging him to permit a vote on the Sisson bill to repeal the so-called "red rider" attached last year to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and forbidding "all teaching of communism" in the Washington schools.

In other words, this was timed to reach Washington on the day that that report was put into the basket, to be printed in the press on the same day—tomorrow—that the report then comes from the Government Printing Office as

a printed document available to Members. I ask again, how did these "reds" in New York know this "sissy" bill would be reported today? Who is keeping them posted? Why did all three of these episodes happen today? Communists hoisted their flag over the Supreme Court to flaunt what they call their contempt for this Government, to show their contempt for law and for orderly government, and they had the audacity in the nighttime to put up over the Supreme Court Building of this Nation their infamous red flag of communistic Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. These three episodes today were so closely allied that none of you can laugh them off. This is a vital question that menacingly concerns the home and loved ones of every citizen of the United States. Just this week the great Government of France was taken over by Communists, and people in France who have worked a lifetime acquiring property are turning their property into gold and money and sending it from France across the ocean as fast as they can get it out of France. Do not you think it cannot happen here.

Roger Baldwin, this man at the head of this American Civil Liberties Union, that sends out this infamous document at this time, has served his sentence in the Federal penitentiary during the war, and he is the man who appeared before your Fish committee and testified, without a blush of shame, that he is in favor of taking this Government over by force and violence. He testified that he was willing to commit wholesale murder if it was necessary to do it.

Do not slumber peacefully on in imagined security, gentlemen, until this Government is taken over sometime overnight. Do not wait until your Army and Navy can be communized, before taking action, which would cause the sacrificing of the lives of 100,000 of the flower of American manhood to take this Government back. America must awake. Let us awake, America! [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BETTER].

Mr. BETTER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speakers who have preceded me, and I notice that a great many of the remarks have been of a political nature. Probably for that reason many Members of the House have left the floor. I regret this, not because they will probably miss a mighty good speech, but because of the facts I am about to present to them relative to the Public Works Administration and their program.

Mr. Chairman, when we voted for the first \$3,300,000,000 public-works appropriation in June of 1933 we did so under the impression that most of it would be used to finance local public works in our home towns, counties, cities, and States. I know there was nothing in the law providing that the money should be used for that purpose but that is what we believed.

When we voted for the second appropriation in June of 1934 we were under the same impression.

And when we voted for the \$4,880,000,000 appropriation in the spring of 1935 we still believed that a large share of it would go to make loans and grants on local public projects through the Public Works Administration; but it has not turned out that way at all.

I have been so much interested in this matter that I have given considerable time to studying the records of the Public Works Administration to determine just what use has been made of the money we appropriated in the belief that a large proportion of it would be used to aid our home communities in building the local improvements that they so badly needed.

I found that only \$421,728,000, or between 12 and 13 percent, of the first \$3,300,000,000 appropriation for Public Works construction was used for loans and grants on 3,925 public improvements built by cities, towns, counties, and States.

The remaining \$2,878,272,000 was used for other purposes.

One-half of it, or \$1,442,348,000 to be exact, was allocated to the departments of the Federal Government and used for purposes for which Congress always had in the past appropriated money in the regular appropriation bills.

Another \$1,187,630,000 was divided among C. W. A., C. C. C., the Farm Credit Administration, the A. A. A., N. R. A., and many other alphabetical agencies. The Emergency Relief Administration got \$114,000,000 in the spring of 1935 to augment funds appropriated to it for direct relief.

Most of the remaining \$248,294,000 was used for loans to railroads.

Now, I realize that this \$2,878,272,000 out of the original \$3,300,000,000 public-works appropriation that was allocated to the Federal departments and for the other purposes I have named all went to create employment and increase purchasing power. I do not complain against it on the ground that it did not accomplish those purposes.

But I am complaining that only \$421,728,000 of it was used for loans and grants to enable the local communities in our districts to build the things they so badly need.

I know that warships, for which \$238,000,000 was allotted to the Navy Department by the President from the first public-works appropriation, are essential for our national defense. But I also know that school houses are just as essential for promoting the general welfare of my constituents as warships are necessary to provide for their national defense.

And I have found in my study of the statistics of the Public Works Administration that only \$88,504,000 was loaned and granted to local communities from the first public-works appropriation to build 830 secondary-school projects.

Considering the danger of war that everybody recognizes today, I do not think the \$238,000,000 allocation for warships was excessive, but I do think the amount of money loaned and granted for school construction was too small. We ought to remedy that now by making further appropriations to continue the making of loans and grants.

Lighthouses and channel markers are essential for the safety of travelers at sea and on our lakes and rivers. More than five and a half millions of dollars was allotted to the Bureau of Lighthouses of the Department of Commerce from the first public-works appropriation. But garbage and rubbish disposal plants help to promote the general welfare of our constituents. And I find that only \$4,762,000 was allotted for that purpose by the Public Works Administration from the first appropriation.

In the beginning, Secretary Ickes himself anticipated that a much greater amount of the first appropriation would be used for loans and grants to our local communities to help them build the things they need and want. In a speech made shortly after he was named Public Works Administrator, he said that he expected approximately \$1,750,000,000 would be used for that purpose.

But the whittling down process of allocating the money to the regular departments and alphabetical agencies of the Government went on and on. The stick got shorter and shorter. And now we find that Mr. Ickes' estimate of \$1,750,000,000 for loans and grants for public-works projects for our constituents has dwindled down to \$421,728,000.

When we passed the \$4,880,000,000 appropriation last spring we thought that at least \$900,000,000 of it would be used for loans and grants made through the Public Works Administration to the local communities in our districts. And what happened? The records of the Public Works Administration show that only \$328,345,465 was used for grants on 4,110 projects in our home communities. This was about 6 percent of the total appropriation.

P. W. A. received applications for thousands of loans and grants that it could not make. Only the other day Secretary Ickes sent up to the Senate, in response to a resolution requesting the information, a list of 6,801 applications for loans and grants totaling \$2,659,000,000 for which no funds are now available.

Some communities in my district are on that list. I know the need of the citizens of those communities for the projects for which they have applied for loans and grants. They made their application in good faith, believing that they had a chance to get the money. They went to considerable trouble to make up their applications, and undoubtedly have been put to considerable expense in getting up plans and making other preliminary preparations.

Other communities in my district have received loans and grants, and it looks unfair to me to say to those whose applications have not yet been acted on that we will now stop appropriating money to aid in the construction of local public works. That looks like discrimination to me.

It not only looks like discrimination to me but it is discrimination.

The first to last, out of the money made available to it by congressional appropriation and the operation of its revolving fund, the Public Works Administration has made loans and grants totaling \$1,250,092,000 on 8,035 local projects in our home communities. I do not know how many communities have projects, but it is less than 8,000 because there are many projects in each of a considerable number of towns and cities. Perhaps if a count of communities instead of projects was made, there would be between six and seven thousand of our towns, cities, and counties where projects are being built.

The P. W. A. has been of tremendous assistance to industry. The construction dollar has a gigantic effect. It reaches practically every niche and corner of our country. It multiplies the business created two and a half to three times that of the original transaction and furnishes a tremendous amount of indirect as well as direct labor. The abrupt discontinuance of this program would be like kicking the props out from under a bridge before the foundation had properly set.

States, cities, counties, villages in your districts and mine demand the approval of their projects.

Besides furnishing employment for men in occupations for which they have been trained, construction work offers a great source of income to Government. You are all familiar with the revenues received from the many industries furnishing material for construction, but I wonder if you realize the large amount of taxes paid by the contractor. I know I did not until recently. For instance, I have the figures of a highway contract let by the State of Ohio on August 13, 1935, for the sum of approximately \$74,000. These show that the contractor paid \$4,075.86 in compensation and taxes of one form or another for that job alone. This amounts to 5½ percent of the contract. Furthermore, it does not include the levy for old-age pension and unemployment insurance, which amounts to approximately 2½ percent for the coming fiscal year and subsequently rises to 9 percent.

This represents an important income to Government from contractors which few people realize, and which would be lost if the Federal Government prosecuted the work by force account rather than the P. W. A. system on a contract basis. Assuming the same percentage applies to other States, a \$700,000,000 P. W. A. program, resulting in \$1,550,000,000 in construction, would result in approximately \$73,000,000 income to Government agencies of one form or another from contractors alone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I notice the gentleman mentioned a figure of \$70,000,000. Is that the figure that he has in mind for the P. W. A.?

Mr. BEITER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman propose that Congress at this time appropriate \$700,000,000 additional funds for P. W. A.?

Mr. BEITER. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Or would he earmark the relief bill that is to come before the House this week?

Mr. BEITER. I propose to earmark the bill that is before the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I had understood that a movement was started in that respect, but that the gentleman had changed his mind and would offer an amendment to provide for additional funds instead of earmarking the relief funds.

Mr. BEITER. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. There are several P. W. A. projects in my own district that have been tentatively approved. P. W. A. projects with which I am familiar are splendid projects.

Mr. BEITER. And probably that same community has gone to considerable expense to prepare plans and specifications, hire architects, and possibly pay attorneys to present the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true, and such communities are left in a very embarrassing position, because my people were led to believe they would get the P. W. A. funds and at least in one or two instances went to the expense and trouble of voting bonds.

Mr. BEITER. And probably in an adjoining community or town a Public Works project has been in operation and that community has already had allocation made to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, there are several such places, I would say.

Mr. BEITER. In addition to this, social security taxation for the fiscal year on direct and indirect labor amounts to approximately \$32,000,000. This brings a total income from contractors and social security taxation of at least \$100,000,000. This is one-seventh of the amount requested for P. W. A. and is returned indirectly to the Government. If the work were conducted other than by contract, however, most of the fund would be lost, as the Government does not tax itself.

Right along this same thought comes that of compensation. When the Government prosecutes relief work directly through force-account methods, it is responsible for personal liability and property damage. It is estimated by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission that compensation for workers alone, excluding the vast amount of claims for property damage, amounts to \$1 per \$100 of the estimated pay roll, or \$18,000,000 for the present program. At the same rate this would equal another \$15,000,000 for the proposed relief program. In contract work, however, compensation and property-damage insurance is carried by the contractor, relieving the Federal Government of all liability and incidentally creating an additional market in insurance values.

It is no wonder that our constituents and our vast industries request P. W. A. support. Particularly so because, in spite of this, the contractor, by reason of his experience, organization, and efficiency, can do a piece of work cheaper than can be done by inexperienced Government agencies. Furthermore, the savings in contract work is not lost to labor—it is passed on—making possible the construction of other jobs which in turn employ workers directly and indirectly. Instead of having one piece of work completed inefficiently and in an unworkmanlike manner, more work is done in an efficient manner. Men are placed to work in their proper trades, and projects are completed which are of great benefit to the sponsor and a credit to the Federal Government.

As a further proof of the indirect beneficial effect of public works, I have secured a break-down of the construction cost of a group of buildings for the Department of Labor, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Post Office Department, Washington, D. C. I have purposely taken these buildings as they are constructed in a community of few industries and have given rise to the question, by some who have not studied the problem, as to what material benefits the construction of these works has been to labor.

The buildings cost \$21,000,000. The surprising part of this is that only \$3,000,000 was actually spent in the District of Columbia; the remaining \$18,000,000 went to 28 different States and placed men to work furnishing the material and equipment for these buildings, as, for example:

Indiana received.....	\$2,500,000
Michigan received.....	1,100,000
New York received.....	1,125,000
Virginia received.....	1,000,000
Pennsylvania received.....	2,500,000

With your permission I shall include in the Appendix a complete break-down by States, showing the far-reaching facts of this local expenditure.

In addition, since these sums only represent direct orders for finished products, there were still further transactions necessary for the securing and transportation of raw materials. These transactions spread throughout the United States like the branches of a mighty river and extend back through many smaller rivers, streams, and brooks to a multitude of individual sources. And, as the water passing through these various channels does work on the way to the resultant river, so the various feeders of industry supply work in converting and transferring the raw materials to the finished product.

It is such a natural course of events that I fail to see how anyone can be unappreciative of the value of indirect employment in stimulating recovery and relieving the unemployment situation.

In regard to the employment directly on the site, I would like to leave this important thought with you. Given a definite job to do, a contractor or a Government agency can only efficiently employ a certain number of men, and in either case this number is approximately the same. The truth in this statement lies in the word "efficiency." It may be justifiable in some cases to sacrifice some efficiency on the site in order to create additional employment, but there is, or at least there should be, a definite limit to this sacrifice. Otherwise our citizens become disgusted with the manner in which the work is prosecuted and the morale of the men on work relief becomes completely broken, not only while they are on that particular work but for the future as well. They see in a force account job their fellow workers doing one-half to one-quarter of what should be done in a day. Then immediately say to themselves: "Why should I work, either? No one else is taking interest in this work. This project when completed is certainly going to be of no credit to me. They have been trifling with that rock excavation for weeks, just throwing money away, when a shot of dynamite and a power shovel for a day or two would complete the excavation and make way for us to get down to doing the real job at hand." This soon makes a shirker and a slacker out of a man; in addition, through lack of proper practice in his trade his skill is lost and a lackadaisical attitude implanted in him soon becomes a habit. The ultimate effect of this demoralization of our former industrious workers is at the present time unknown. Only the future will divulge the effects.

It is things like this which are easily eliminated in contract work. No one wants them to occur. You and I do not, and neither does the W. P. A. Nevertheless, it does happen in thousands and thousands of cases which are not under contract.

The difference of 36 percent between the sponsors' contribution of 55 percent for P. W. A. projects and 19 percent for force account work is more than adequate to care for any justifiable inefficiency in construction procedure. Certainly the evidence has been submitted to you regarding the definite benefit to indirect labor and industry warrants the purchase of additional material for durable public works.

The permanency of the projects and their future benefits to society should be an important consideration when computing the man-year cost. It is perfectly obvious that a slightly higher man-year cost for a project which is going to benefit society for 30 years is warranted over other proj-

ects, the life of which is 5 years. For example: The average life of P. W. A. projects is from 30 to 70 years. This would make the yearly amortization cost per man-year for the principal investment equal to one-thirtieth of the original man-year cost, or \$615 for direct and indirect labor divided by 30, or only \$20.50 per year. In order to get a comparison with this for less permanent work let us take the example of a low-class roadway. The road may be rough, graded by hand, and the roadbed built of local run-of-bank gravel obtained from a public-owned pit. The construction of this road would require practically no other material and consequently furnish no indirect labor. Eliminating foremen, the road could be built with all common labor. Now, for a simple example, assume that labor receives \$50 per month, which equals an annual cost to Federal Government of \$600.

The life of this project would hardly exceed 1 year. The first winter and spring thaws would probably render the surface impassable. But, for the sake of argument, say the life is 5 years. Now, by dividing 600 by 5 years, the cost per man-year is computed as equally as \$120 compared with \$20.50 for the average P. W. A. project. In other words, this poor-class road having a 5-year life, requiring all common labor at \$600 per year, cost on the yearly basis nearly six times as much as the average P. W. A. type of construction.

That certainly is proof enough that P. W. A. projects which cost practically the same as other types of projects when direct and indirect labor is considered are ultimately vastly more reasonable. [Applause.]

The estimated cost of \$21,000,000 for the architectural service, and construction of the group of buildings for the Department of Labor, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Post Office Department Building in Washington, D. C. It is estimated the distribution of expenditures for the District of Columbia and various States from which the supply of material is derived and fabrication is in accordance with the following:

Alabama	\$30,000
Arkansas	160,000
California	500,000
Connecticut	600,000
Delaware	40,000
Georgia	100,000
Illinois	400,000
Indiana	2,500,000
Maryland	850,000
Maine	50,000
Massachusetts	300,000
Michigan	1,100,000
Minnesota	600,000
Missouri	200,000
New Hampshire	400,000
New Jersey	890,000
New York	1,250,000
North Carolina	100,000
Ohio	850,000
Oregon	50,000
Pennsylvania	2,500,000
South Dakota	10,000
Tennessee	650,000
Vermont	300,000
Virginia	1,000,000
West Virginia	170,000
Wisconsin	400,000
Transportation (various States)	2,000,000
District of Columbia	3,000,000
Total	21,000,000

MATERIALS USED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUILDING

Structural steel, ore from Minnesota, 16,400 tons. Rolling and fabrication, Pennsylvania.
Limestone from Indiana, 2,000 carloads.
Granite, quarried in Connecticut, sawed, cut, and milled in Massachusetts, 150 carloads.
Marble from Missouri, 900 tons.
Mankato stone from Minnesota, 800 tons.
Base marble from Vermont, 470 tons.
Domestic travertine from Colorado and Georgia of which 500 tons of travertine chips from Georgia were used for terrazzo floors.
Cafeteria, serving rooms, and kitchen floors: tile from West Virginia, 35 tons.
Toilet rooms: Wall and floor tile from Ohio, 300 tons.
Common brick from District of Columbia, 10,000,000.

Face brick from Pennsylvania and Virginia: 1,500,000.
Gray brick for boiler room from Pennsylvania, 200,000.
Terra cotta from North Carolina and West Virginia, 27,000 tons.
Reinforced-concrete piling supporting the building, 80 miles or 14,000 piles, Raymond Concrete Pile Co. of New York.
Plastering on walls and ceilings, 99 acres.
Base of building, up to sill of first floor windows is of granite; balance of walls is of Indiana limestone except four courts of brick.
Roof, 95,000 square feet or 400 tons of promenade tile and 160,000 square feet or 1,200 tons of mission tile. Two tons of copper nails were used in the roof.
Bronze hardware used, 25 tons.

Structural steel:	
Pennsylvania	\$1,050,000
Minnesota	400,000
Ohio	30,000
West Virginia	20,000
Total	1,500,000
Cement:	
Maryland	450,000
Virginia	450,000
Pennsylvania	50,000
West Virginia	50,000
Total	1,000,000
Limestone, Indiana	2,500,000
Total	2,500,000
Marble:	
Vermont	300,000
Tennessee	650,000
Missouri	50,000
Total	1,000,000
Granite:	
Massachusetts	400,000
New Hampshire	400,000
Total	800,000
Clay products:	
New Jersey	500,000
Ohio	400,000
Virginia	300,000
Maryland	300,000
Pennsylvania	100,000
Total	1,600,000
Lime and gypsum products:	
Michigan	500,000
Ohio	100,000
West Virginia	100,000
Total	700,000
Electrical products:	
Ohio	70,000
New York	300,000
Michigan	300,000
Pennsylvania	450,000
New Jersey	100,000
Alabama	30,000
Connecticut	200,000
Total	1,450,000
Bronze products:	
Michigan	100,000
Connecticut	100,000
Pennsylvania	100,000
Minnesota	50,000
Arkansas	50,000
Wisconsin	100,000
Total	500,000
Metal products:	
New York	100,000
Ohio	100,000
Wisconsin	100,000
Minnesota	100,000
Illinois	100,000
Maryland	100,000
Pennsylvania	100,000
Arkansas	50,000
Missouri	50,000
Total	800,000

Lumber products:

Oregon	\$50,000
Virginia	100,000
Wisconsin	200,000
Georgia	100,000
Michigan	100,000
North Carolina	100,000
Maine	50,000
Total	700,000

Glass:

Pennsylvania	50,000
Ohio	50,000
Total	100,000

Paint:

Missouri	50,000
South Dakota	10,000
Arkansas	10,000
New Jersey	40,000
Delaware	40,000
Total	150,000

Asphalt products:

New Jersey	50,000
Ohio	50,000
Total	100,000

Asbestos products:

Pennsylvania	50,000
New York	50,000
Total	100,000

Plumbing, heating, ventilating, air conditioning:

Illinois	300,000
Minnesota	50,000
Arkansas	50,000
Missouri	50,000
Michigan	100,000
Pennsylvania	300,000
Connecticut	300,000
Ohio	50,000
New York	300,000
Total	1,500,000

Elevators:

Pennsylvania	500,000
New Jersey	200,000
Total	700,000

Sand and gravel: Virginia

400,000

Railroads

2,000,000

Architecture:

New York	500,000
California	500,000
Total	1,000,000

Materials used in the construction of the Post Office Department Building, Interstate Commerce Commission, Department of Labor and connecting wing building, Washington, D. C.

Combined cost	\$20,000,000
Spent in Washington	3,000,000
Spent in States	17,000,000
Structural steel	1,500,000
Fabrication: Pennsylvania	850,000
Materials: Minnesota, Ohio, and West Virginia	450,000
Cement:	
Maryland	450,000
Virginia	450,000
Limestone: Indiana	2,500,000
Marble: Vermont, Tennessee, and Missouri	800,000
Granite: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and North Carolina	500,000
Terra cotta: New Jersey and Ohio	425,000
Clay products: New Jersey and Ohio	410,000
Brick: Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania	650,000
Lime and gypsum: Michigan, Ohio, and West Virginia	350,000
Electrical products: Ohio, New York, Connecticut, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Alabama	1,200,000
Bronze and hardware: Minnesota, Michigan, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Arkansas	220,000
Hollow metal: New York, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota	270,000
Lumber: Oregon, Virginia, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and Michigan	630,000
Plumbing, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning: Minnesota, Arkansas, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Ohio	1,580,000

Materials used in the construction of the Post Office Department Building, Interstate Commerce Commission, Department of Labor and connecting wing building, Washington, D. C.—Continued

Paint: Missouri, the Dakotas, Arkansas, New Jersey, and Delaware	\$110,000
Glass: Pennsylvania and Ohio	95,000
Ornamental iron: Wisconsin, New York, and Illinois	130,000
Asphalt products: Ohio and New Jersey	115,000
Metal windows: Maryland, Illinois, New York, and Minnesota	150,000
Asbestos products: Pennsylvania and New York	115,000
Elevators: Ohio, New York, Connecticut, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Alabama, and Minnesota	710,000
Sand and gravel: Maryland and Virginia	450,000
Reinforcing steel: Pennsylvania	250,000
Freight	1,300,000
Sculpture: New York	400,000
Piling, metal shells: Ohio	470,000
Bonds: New York, Connecticut, Maryland	150,000
Sheet metal: Colorado	85,000
Vault doors: Pennsylvania	10,000
Cork floors: Pennsylvania	10,000
Flagstones: Kentucky	15,000

Total	16,300,000
Balance representing money spent in Washington, contractors' profit, and miscellaneous items	3,700,000

Total	20,000,000
Total number of States directly benefited	28

Freight item of \$1,300,000 of benefit to great number of railroads. The employment population benefited covers many classes, not only those occupied in various building trades and in manufacture of building materials, but also many of the "white collar" type, such as clerks, salesmen, draftsmen, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] has expired.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, on May 1 there was laid on our desks the first report of one of the New Deal agencies which has quietly been going about its business of making over America by bringing to us the Utopia that is the promised goal of those who are most outspoken in their attacks upon the American system. Although the agency has been in existence for a full year, the report is termed an "interim report" and not a full report as many of us would like to have had and feel entitled to have received. The explanation given by the Administrator for not giving a complete report to Congress is that "we should prefer not to stop in such a busy time for reporting; we should prefer to wait until the program is more complete."

I speak of the Resettlement Administration, headed by that most energetic and well-known but impractical and visionary thinker of the New Deal, Rexford G. Tugwell. He it was, you will recall, who once wrote, "I shall roll up my sleeves and make over America" and, as recently as the fall of 1935, said, "We must make irrevocable political commitment to disciplined democracy, to calculated change of institutions." Perhaps in his latter statement he took his cue from Mussolini, who told the world 13 years ago that the first thing he would do as head of the government would be "to enforce discipline, discipline, discipline."

"Disciplined democracy"—what could Mr. Tugwell have meant when he used that expression? Being the highly educated person that he is we must believe that he uses words which will express his thoughts as accurately as our language will permit. An examination of the word discipline reveals that it is to instruct, to educate, to inform, to train the mind by instruction, and also means to regulate, to govern, and to keep in subjection. Surely if Mr. Tugwell had intended to say that our objective in government was an "instructed" or an "educated" or an "informed" democracy, he would have said so and no one would have taken exception to it. In fact, an enlightened democracy has been the goal of our people since the beginning of our Government and its achievement is one of the most wholesome characteristics of a sound and secure Government of and by the people. We have not quickly forgotten the memorable words of George Washington who said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened." But Dr. Tugwell did not

mean that the desired accomplishment was an informed democracy or an educated society; it was to be a disciplined democracy.

Most of us have a pretty fair idea of the meaning of democracy, although the word in recent years has been greatly abused. We understand that democracy is a system of government under which all of us have the same rights and privileges and opportunities, and we know that it is a government of persons selected by ourselves who are committed to work for us and protect our rights and interests. With this understanding of democracy, it is rather difficult to absorb in our minds the full meaning of a disciplined democracy, a regulated democracy, a subjected democracy. How, we ask, can we continue to be democratic but at the same time be regulated and regimented and controlled as Mr. Tugwell seems to say we must be? The term is self-contradictory; democracy and the kind of discipline Mr. Tugwell has in mind cannot travel along the same course, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, the American people prefer their freedom of government and in government than to live under the restrictive rules and regulations of a paternalistic government.

Let us take a look at this agency through which Dr. Tugwell is going to remake America. Certainly Congress had nothing to do with the creation of the Resettlement Administration, has no control over it, and the Administration is not accountable to Congress for any of its activities. Small wonder that the "interim report" to Congress is so full of generalities and reports so little. Even though the representatives of the people had no voice in its creation, yet we find that it directs the lives of hundreds of thousands of our people whose income and outgo and whose activities of everyday life are planned for them by the managerial staff of the Resettlement Administration.

It will be recalled that the President was given \$4,000,000 with which to relieve unemployment by the exercise of almost unlimited powers. He in turn, by Executive order, gave to Dr. Tugwell broad and unlimited powers and a considerable portion of the fund with which to carry out Dr. Tugwell's ideas. The first Executive order, dated April 30, 1935, gave the Resettlement Administration these powers:

(a) To administer approved projects involving resettlement of destitute or low-income families from rural and urban areas, including the establishment, maintenance, and operation, in such connection, of communities in rural and suburban areas.

(b) To initiate and administer a program of approved projects with respect to soil erosion, stream pollution, sea-coast erosion, reforestation, forestation, and flood control.

(c) To make loans as authorized under the said Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 to finance, in whole or in part, the purchase of farm lands and necessary equipment by farmers, farm tenants, croppers, or farm laborers.

In September of that year a further Executive order was issued repeating the paragraphs just given but adding to the second paragraph these four seemingly harmless but highly significant words, "and other useful projects." Thus Tugwell was empowered to initiate and administer almost any kind of program under the sun, and, what is more, he was given the wherewithal to do it.

According to the "interim report" the functions of the administration are segregated into six divisions. The first of these is that of land utilization designed to acquire large areas of unproductive or submarginal land which are to be devoted to recreational parks, game preserves, forests, and grazing. On April 1, 1936, there were 206 such land acquisition projects to include a total of nearly 10,000,000 acres of land, of which 2,000,000 have been bought and the Government committed to the purchase of the remaining 8,000,000 acres.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I will be glad to yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he was opposed to this resettlement?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman will see my position before I have concluded.

For the use of this division there was made available over \$48,000,000 for land acquisition and \$18,000,000 for development and conservation. The amount needed for complete development is over \$40,000,000, instead of the \$18,000,000, making a total cost of this one experiment approximately \$90,000,000, or, roughly, \$10 per acre for every acre of land thus taken out of production, a rather dear price to pay for land that admittedly is worthless and unproductive.

The second division is that of rural rehabilitation, for the purpose of lending money to distressed farmers to permit them to carry on their work. Under the established rules, any farmer is ineligible for a loan if he could obtain it from any of the commercial banks, the Federal land bank, Production Credit Corporation, or any other private or governmental agency. In other words, a farmer's credit must be absolutely exhausted before he can get relief. The total amount of public money loaned or granted and committed to be loaned and granted to these persons is \$106,000,000 in the first year of activity. Of course, it is expected by those in charge that the bulk of this sum will be repaid by the farmer, including the grants he received. As it is so naively expressed by the "interim report", "it was estimated, when the program was formulated, that 70 percent of the total loans would be repaid." Considering the type of risks involved in these loans, there are few persons whose thoughts are not directed by their wishes who will agree that 70 or even 50 percent of these advances will be repaid. We can easily anticipate the procedure that will come in the future concerning these loans: First, through sympathy for those who are unable to pay, the interest on the loans will be waived by the Government; then, after a bit, the same generous attitude of those controlling the public money will cause them to cancel the farmers' obligations entirely. Indeed, the Government will be extremely fortunate if 30 percent of the principal of these loans is recouped, to say nothing of the carrying charges. Through the farm-debt-adjustment program of this division of the Resettlement Administration, a seemingly worth-while service has been rendered to the overburdened farmer. Acting as the negotiator, the Government has brought the farmer and his creditors together in an effort to not only scale down the principal but also to reduce the interest rates on the debts and to extend the dates of maturity. The adjustments that have been accomplished by his method have been estimated to amount to approximately \$30,000,000 by June 30 of this year. The unfortunate part of this debt-adjustment program is that once the Government has succeeded in lightening the debt load the farmer has to carry, the Government has immediately put that same indebted farmer back into debt to the extent of an aggregate of over \$53,000,000.

The next function of this "little entente" is the Rural Resettlement Division, which establishes communities of farmers who have been economically unable to make a living or who have been moved from unproductive land bought by the Government.

If all of the 196 projects were to be developed they would provide locations for approximately 25,000 families, require the purchase of approximately 1,400,000 acres of land, and require a Budget of approximately \$95,000,000.

So says the report—or a cost of \$3,800 per family. We are told that there are more than 500,000 rural rehabilitation families on farms that should be abandoned, who are worthy resettlement clients. At the above rate per family, the total costs of resettling these needy families will be nearly \$2,000,000,000 and involve the acquisition of nearly 30,000,000 acres of land. Curiously enough, the report is strangely silent on the amount of money that has been allocated to it or the cost of its activities for rural resettlement to date. Can it be that this studied failure to give even a partial explanation of the per family costs to date is an indication that the ultimate cost of the homes far exceeded their expectations and the ability of the homesteaders to finance? From other sources we learn that the

homes of one of the projects, in Georgia, have averaged nearly \$6,000 each, while, in the opinion of the management, \$4,000 is the largest debt these selected homesteaders might reasonably be expected to pay off in 30 years' time and at the low interest rate provided.

Besides the management and construction divisions, which are of relative unimportance at this time, except that each of them contain hundreds of administrative and clerical positions and have but very little work to do, the final division is that of suburban resettlement, which has undertaken the construction of houses on the outskirts of industrial cities for use by low-income families whose heads work in the cities. To date, four of these projects have been inaugurated in Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, and Ohio. For this purpose \$31,000,000 has been allocated. The communities are to be complete in every respect, with stores, garages, post offices, theaters, and other business establishments. Small garden areas and facilities for rearing cows and poultry are to be included for each home. Because of the feature of being located in the country with lots of green grass growing all around, these resettlements have acquired the title of Greenbelt, Greenhills, Greendale, and Greenbrook.

When one looks at the ultimate costs of the respective projects and realizes the impossibility of the Government ever recovering the investment it has in them, the conclusion is inescapable that the greenness of the name given these settlements comes not from the verdure of the surrounding countryside but the impracticability of the utopian visionaries sponsoring the program.

Greenbelt is to have 1,000 homes at a total cost of \$6,950,000; Greenhills to have 1,000 families at a cost of \$8,750,000; Greendale will contain 750 homes with an aggregate investment of \$7,050,000; and Greenbrook 750 dwellings at a cost of \$7,150,000. The average cost of these 3,500 homes and settlements will be approximately \$8,500 each.

Imagine a worker of low income being able to buy and pay for a house that costs him around \$8,000 and at the same time to pay taxes on it, keep it in repair, carry the necessary insurance, and with it all to feed, clothe, and educate his children! It is unthinkable that this can be done. In the report is this very significant statement:

The question of ability to pay is a major consideration in arriving at the sales price, and it is felt the maximum amount a person may be able to pay for shelter is 25 percent of his income, and on very small incomes the percentage will, of course, be lower.

Assuming that a person from this class of workers, receiving an annual salary of \$2,000, pays at the rate of 25 percent of his income, it will require 30 years in which to pay off the purchase price of the house at the very low rate of 4 percent, and when he finally completes payments on the purchase price he will have nothing but an old, worn-out house. There can be no doubt that the Government does not expect to be repaid its complete investment in these projects. That this is true is inferentially admitted by Dr. Tugwell, for in a speech at Cincinnati on February 3, in discussing suburban housing, he said:

Let me frankly admit that there may be some element of subsidy if we are to maintain building and maintenance standing and keep rents down.

The most that the average urban worker would be able to pay for his home is from \$2,000 to \$4,000, and if the Government is to subsidize the worker as Dr. Tugwell says it must, the most it can be expected to recover from the cost of these four projects, alone totaling \$31,000,000, is from 25 to 50 percent. Perhaps there might not be much basis for complaint if the program of suburban resettlement were to stop with the projects now undertaken, but this is not the case, for Tugwell has said that—

If private industry persists in its refusal to exploit the possibilities which are clearly there, the pressure of public opinion may force the Government to enter this field on a very wide scale.

Certainly private industry is not going to enter this field of building houses at a cost of from \$8,000 to \$9,000 and selling them at a price from \$2,000 to \$4,000. If the public is fully informed of the nature of these projects and the tremendous

loss to the Government which must be borne by the taxpayers, public opinion will demand that these experiments be not carried further.

Of all the homesteads, rural and suburban, which have been created by Tugwell, not a single one has yet been sold. True, many of them are occupied by tenants who are there under a licensing agreement, paying a rental of approximately \$10 per room per month. In these licensing agreements the licensee agrees to—

Cultivate and farm the land included within the homestead to the best of his ability, and to adopt and adhere to any cropping program and tillage practice stipulated by the licensor (the Government).

In this way the Government exacts from the homesteader an obligation to follow any program relating to the use of the homestead which the Government may see fit. Here we have the same regimentation of our people that was the basis of the popular complaint against the codes of the N. R. A. and the cropping rules laid down by the Government under the A. A. A. and the Potato Act. It will be interesting to observe how long the homesteaders of these settlements will submit to governmental dictation in their everyday life.

The costs of these various divisions of the Resettlement Administration as set forth above do not include the expense of administration. In some 19 separate buildings in the city of Washington are offices harboring the administrators of this expensive socialistic program. An employee of the Resettlement Administration says that the Administration pay roll is \$2,000,000 per month, and that nearly a third of the employees are receiving salaries in excess of civil-service ratings, with hundreds on the pay roll at salaries from \$2,500 to \$5,000 per year. A recent series of articles in a local newspaper discloses that Tugwell has employed nearly 17,000 persons to administer his work, at an aggregate expense of over \$24,000,000 per year for salaries alone. There has already been allocated to this alphabetical effort to produce "more abundant life" out of funds given the President under blanket authority over \$278,000,000, and within the past month we have heard that Tugwell is asking for \$200,000,000 more to complete his program, making a total of nearly one-half billion dollars for the purpose of planning and "building 20,000 new homes and work places for the people who are on the land we have purchased", and yet within the past 3 days we hear Tugwell say that—

This—

The 20,000 new homes—

is the merest fraction of the numbers who would like to be relocated, but it is all we could do with our time and money.

There seems to be no bottom to the pit in which Tugwell is pouring the taxpayers' money, all for the purpose of carrying out his one-time threat of rolling up his sleeves and making over America, and this at the expense of the taxpayer who does have a home and has paid for it through his own hard work, thrift, and self-denial, and further at the expense of a broken morale and initiative on the part of those who accept the paternalism of our benevolent Government. If America needs to be "made over", it can only be done by those processes which have been tried and found true, namely, thrift, sobriety, morality, and industry, and an adherence to the true principles of a Republic under our written Constitution. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN].

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, I arise to express my regret at the remarks of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], made in yesterday's RECORD, in which he impugns the honesty, sincerity, and instincts of fair play of our most wholesome neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada. He says:

The recent action of the Canadian Government suggests strongly that from their standpoint the Canadian agreement is to a substantial extent a scrap of paper binding still upon our Government and our people but with myriad loopholes through which they can vary their trade policies as they please.

That statement is as unfair as anything could possibly be, and is only equalled in lack of knowledge by the contents of the rest of the speech.

To understand the utter baselessness of the entire argument of the gentleman from Maine, a few remarks as to the Canadian classification of tariff schedules would be a point. They have four different types of rates. The lowest is the rate prevailing among the members of the British Empire. Next are the intermediate rates prevailing among the most favorable nations outside of the British Empire. Then the so-called countervailing rates, which cannot be lower than the intermediate rates, but equal the rates imposed by the tariff of other countries selling the same commodities to Canada which Canada sells to that country.

In other words, the countervailing rate is designed to impose the same burden on the same commodities which Canada buys and sells. The last and highest Canadian rates are the general tariffs which apply to all other countries.

Following the adoption of the Smoot-Hawley tariff and up until January 1, 1936, our trade with Canada was taxed under the general tariff schedules of that country. With the reciprocity treaty a number of our items of export to Canada received special rates, of mutual advantage to both countries and approximately 600 items not mentioned in the treaty were allowed entrance under the intermediate rates.

There was no agreement of any kind with Canada prohibiting her from changing her intermediate tariff rates at any time she desired. Our State Department made a definite effort to get these commodities bound to the intermediate rate, but without success. Canada clearly reserved her right to change these rates at will.

The State Department, in its press release dated November 23, 1935, expressly says of these items on the intermediate list:

Although the duty reduction on these items, unlike the items in schedule I, are not bound as to duration, they become effective immediately when the agreement enters into force.

Nevertheless, the gentleman from Maine states:

It remained for our Canadian neighbors, however, very promptly to educate our State Department and our people to some of the possibilities inherent in this agreement.

If there is anyone needing education concerning the Canadian reciprocal treaty, it is the gentleman from Maine. As another evidence of his abysmal want of information on this subject, he says:

Canada was left free to make any tariff concessions that might at any time seem advisable to any of the British commonwealth of nations, and the United States was left helpless.

The United States reserved to itself the right to make any change in its tariff schedules on all items not listed in the treaty just the same as the Canadian Government. It is just as helpless as the Canadian Government, no more or no less.

The increase in rates which the Canadian Government has made on potatoes, eggs, flour, cut flowers, and raisins simply raises the duty on those commodities to equal the duty which the United States places on the same commodities coming from Canada.

If the gentleman from Maine desires these duties lowered going into Canada, he ought, in all fairness then, to advocate that we reduce our duties on the same commodities. If we do, Canada will at once respond.

The Canadian Minister of Finance, in referring to these countervailing rates, states:

This means that other countries who both buy from and sell to us these commodities have it in their own power, by reciprocal action on their part, to enable us to reduce to the level of the rates stated in our tariff * * *. May I make it clear that our attitude continues to be * * * we do not desire nor intend to raise tariffs; we do by the countervailing duties invite other countries to bring their tariffs down to the level of ours.

The apparent obsession of the gentleman from Maine that we should maintain a duty of 75 cents a hundred pounds on potatoes coming from Canada to us and then have the privilege of selling potatoes to Canada free of duty is just about

as juvenile and impossible as is the theme of his whole speech to the effect that the people in Maine can prosper by high tariff duties while the rest of the country is suffering from it.

The gentleman professes interest in potatoes and uses that as a basis for his high-tariff arguments. On May 1, 1935, No. 1 grade potatoes were selling at 39½ cents a hundred. May 1, 1936, the same potatoes were selling at \$2 a hundred. In 1935, on an ad-valorem basis, potatoes carried a tariff rate of almost 200 percent. In 1936 the tariff on an ad-valorem basis was 37½ percent.

The prosperity of the country will raise the prices of Maine potatoes, as well as the prices of Wisconsin dairy products, many times more effectively than any tariff duties.

Our records for 1934 and 1935 show that foreign trade increased with countries having reciprocal treaties in a ratio six times as great as with nonreciprocal countries. What an utterly asinine suggestion it is for local representatives to come before this body and attack reciprocity treaties because they imagine some of their local interests may be injuriously affected.

The gentleman seems to complain of the tariff reduction that Canada has extended to us since the treaty even as loudly as he does of tariff increases. He says:

Canada lowered the duties on things they desired to buy from us for the benefit of their customers.

The inference is that, according to his idea, Canada ought to have lowered her duties for the benefit of our exporters. Such a contention would not be any more childish than his idea that Canada ought to submit to our potato tariff of 75 cents and let us sell in Canada duty free. Certainly Canada is interested in her own people who are buying these commodities. She realizes that it is just as desirable to make a profit in a purchase as it is in a sale. To that extent she is just a little better informed on the question of political economy than our high-tariff advocates.

Canada, in her last budget, granted us lower duties on a great many more commodities than she raised and has informed us that she will lower the duties on those raised commodities if we will do the same thing in our tariff.

Could anything be more fair and decent? And yet the gentleman from Maine accuses the Canadian Government of bad faith.

Another statement of the high-tariff gentleman from Maine reads as follows:

We are trading a market of 100,000,000 consumers in this country for a market of 10,000,000 consumers in our neighbor to the north.

Did it ever occur to the gentleman that Canadians at the same time are submitting their market to the pressure of 100,000,000 producers, while we are only subject to that of 10,000,000 producers? As long as the people in a foreign nation pay their bills they are good customers, regardless of the population involved. They can only consume in proportion to what they produce, and if they are few in number with low production they will sell just that much less to us.

The Canadian people have been excellent customers of ours under reciprocity. In the first 3 months of this year we sold them \$14,299,000 in commodities more than we purchased from them. Their increased purchases per capita from us during reciprocity has amounted to 72 cents, while our increased purchases per capita from them has amounted to but 14 cents.

If anybody has any basis to complain, it rests with the people of Canada—not with us.

The struggle of a high-tariff group of antiadministration forces is so utterly impotent that it has taken on a somewhat humorous stage. The great majority of the Republican press has deserted them; the leadership of the United States Chamber of Commerce has seen the light; and even their "brain trust", which they have recently been forced to employ, has backed up on them in their efforts to strangle foreign trade. At least three members of that learned organization—the Republican "brain trust"—Prof. Niles Carpenter, of Buffalo; Prof. Frederick Bradford, of Lehigh; Prof. Rufus S. Tucker,

of Harvard; were all signers of the original protest against the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Colonel Knox, one of their Presidential aspirants, has openly approved reciprocity. Even the irreconcilable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has recently become mysteriously silent.

Another outstanding member of their advisory board is Prof. Asher Hobson, of Wisconsin. He is generally credited with having been responsible for a large part of the Canadian reciprocal treaty. Yet as a "brain truster" he is now trying to inject enough intelligence into the antiadministration groups to keep them from being ridiculous in the coming campaign.

The unfortunate part about this whole business is that foreign nations cannot get the humor generated by the feeble remarks of the high-tariff bloc, and when a Member of this body spreads on the record ill-advised, baseless, and unfair charges against one of our friendly neighbors there is a danger of these remarks being taken as having some weight, and therefore they ought not to go unanswered. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, we seem to be without a plan. We came into this panic without intelligent planning. We, in Minnesota, in the midst of prosperity and during the years when things were riding high, told the folks that a panic and a depression was impending. Now, in this bill we are appropriating millions of dollars and we seem to have no real plans. Are we ever going to do intelligent national planning in this country? This experience we are now having ought to teach us that.

I think it is all right to have this rural resettlement. Why not build these homes for the people? Let us have resettlement in the rural areas. They are tearing down a slum area in my home city, in my district, and building houses there. I cannot see anything wrong with that. Why should not homes be built there? Why should not folks be given an opportunity to live in better homes and pleasant places? Why not?

I believe in these T. V. A.'s. I voted for Muscle Shoals during the War, and I see some distinguished gentlemen before me who were here at that time and who voted for that project. Now, why not continue that? I cannot see why we should just put out money for relief. Why not furnish self-respecting work of some kind. Why not put it into public works of some kind, so that a man is not just given a certain sum of money to enable him to eat today when he will be just as hungry tomorrow. Why not have some work done at union wages, giving an American standard of living—something constructive that adds to the capital of the country. That is what we believe in; that is what we want; that is intelligent national planning.

A lot of folks find fault with the administration. I am not an administration spokesman. I am probably critical of both major parties, but it seems to me some errors are bound to be made no matter who handles the work. I believe we should have an American standard of living at all times, and where the American standard of living has not been adhered to I do find fault; but where they are seeking to build in this crisis, and construct, and resettle, certainly there the administration ought to be encouraged.

I want to see more construction. I want to see the streams harnessed in order that we may afford light, current, and power to the whole country of the United States. I want to see a blaze of electric light and power throughout these United States of ours so that electric current becomes available at cost to every American home. I want to see woman emancipated from the slavery of the kitchen. I want the farmer lifted from his back-breaking toil. We have the resources, we have the men, we have the money to do this; and if we would only forget this saving of the world and this nonsense about going to war to end war and stop spending money in absurd foreign adventures, and build our own resources for our own people in this America of ours, we would get along better. We should spend our money here on something for our own people. That is constructive states-

manship, proposed by our Farmer-Labor Party; that is good Minnesota doctrine, and I ask your attention now before it is too late.

I have not written my speech; I am just talking straight from the shoulder and right out of my heart, just the way I feel about these things. So far as the administration is moving along these lines I say it deserves credit. Where the administration makes mistakes it should be corrected. I have no sympathy with those who just criticize and criticize and want to save some money for millionaires and billionaires. There are plenty of men who have huge incomes in this country. Let them be patriotic and pay this bill without whining. Let this money be expended for the people. And now there is talk about investigating the Townsend plan—a few thousand dollars spent for salaries and expenses in the interest of old-age pensions. Why do they not investigate J. P. Morgan and Eugene Grace, or some of these men who have billions of dollars and millions of income every year. Investigate them. That would be more to the point. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCORMACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOURLY OF MEETING

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow; and in explanation, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I will say it is the hope of those in charge of the bill, as well as of the minority members of the committee, that if we finish debate tomorrow, we may proceed with the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule, and take it up to the point of the motion to recommit, in which event it will be the purpose to adjourn over until Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate no. 58 to the bill H. R. 12098, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 9, 20, 25, 29, 35, 42, and 45 to the bill H. R. 11035, entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill S. 3789, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C.," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COPELAND, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. JOHNSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 381, entitled "An act for the relief of the Confed-

erated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico."

ALBERT THESING, JR.

Mr. DUFFY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of Albert Thesing, Jr., with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the parents of Albert Thesing, Jr."

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CENTURY OF PROGRESS CELEBRATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of The Century of Progress Celebration of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

THE CENTURY OF PROGRESS CELEBRATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

The founding of the first American chapter of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the memory of its members who defended old St. Patrick's Cathedral, Prince and Mulberry Streets, in New York City against the Know-Nothings mob in 1844 were commemorated in that city on Saturday and Sunday, the 2d and 3d of May 1936.

"Be ever patriotic and live by the Constitution," Cardinal Hayes declared in an address to more than 2,500 persons of Irish birth or ancestry gathered at St. Patrick's Cathedral on May 2, 1936, for a pontifical Mass in celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

"The flag of our country stands very much in need of loyalty today," the cardinal said, "and I feel that the men of this order will lay down their lives for this country."

The cardinal addressed the gathering after a sermon in which the Most Reverend James A. Griffin, bishop of Springfield, Ill., praised the religious courage of the Irish spirit. Referring to the bishop's sermon, Cardinal Hayes said the Irish spirit in this country and in this city was "the very spirit for which the cathedral stands. The Irishman has a reputation for being a good soldier. It springs from his faith—fighting for God first, last, and always."

The one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the order in the United States was observed with a 2-day celebration. More than 1,600 persons attended a dinner at the Hotel Astor Saturday night, at which Gov. James M. Curley, of Massachusetts, was the principal speaker.

Every State in the Union was represented in the gathering of the order for the ceremonies in the cathedral. The delegates marched to and from the cathedral escorted by a uniformed contingent of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry—old Sixty-ninth—and a band that played Irish airs. A color guard carried the emblem of the order, gold over green, with the Irish and American flags crossing and two hands, representing the two countries, clasped firmly in a gesture of friendship.

Irish music filled the cathedral. Cardinal Hayes presided on his throne. The opening march, played by Pietro Yon, organist, was O'Donnell Aboe.

A bronze tablet commemorating the founding—near the site of St. James' Church in May 1836—of the New York chapter of the A. O. H. was installed at St. James' and another tablet at St. Patrick's. The dedication ceremonies closed the order's centennial celebration, which started Saturday.

One thousand members marched from St. James' Church and then to old St. Patrick's. More than 10,000 other persons lined the route of march. An escort of six mounted policemen was followed by the green and tan costumed County Tyrone Pipers' Band.

Speaking of old St. Patrick's, Monsignor McIntyre recalled how a band of Know-Nothings had come to New York in April 1844 to burn that edifice. Members of the New York chapter of the A. O. H. assembled there, however, and repelled the invaders.

Monsignor McIntyre also spoke of the gifts of religion and patriotism that Irishmen have brought to other lands, notably to the United States.

John J. Sheahan, chairman of the St. Patrick's Day committee, said that religion and patriotism had been inextricably joined through Ireland's history, and that these qualities had been handed down to Irish-Americans.

In his sermon, Bishop Griffin recalled the spirit displayed by the early members of the Hibernians and pointed to their courage

and that of the Irish race as an example of endurance that might be emulated now in countries where religious freedom is threatened.

President Roosevelt sent a letter to Edward J. McCullen, secretary of the centenary committee, in which he praised the contribution made to New York and the United States by persons of Irish blood.

"In peace and war they have been in the forefront of all activity," the President wrote. "New York has not forgotten, nor can ever forget, the old Sixty-ninth Regiment of Infantry—the 'fighting Irish' of song and story. With deep appreciation do we recall the services of the successor of the old Sixty-ninth, the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment in the Rainbow Division. And that brings to mind a gallant figure whose name is forever associated with the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Regiment. I counted him among my dearest friends. He was in our midst but a few short years ago; his passing brought sorrow to all hearts; his memory is in benediction."

"Father Duffy was characteristically Irish in the apostolic zeal of his ministry, in the fervor of his patriotism, and in his love and good will toward all men. I know he will have a place in the hearts of all who take part in this celebration. I like to think of Father Duffy as typical of the great race which has given so much to America."

The Ancient Order of Hibernians claims descent from the Ancient Irish Orders of Knighthood, from the Knights of the Golden Chain and the Bardic Order, the Feni Erin of Leinster, the Knights of the Red Branch of Ulster, the Clan Deagha of Munster, and the Clanna Morna in Connaught.

The modern organization traces its beginning to Rory O'Moore, who revived the ancient orders in the Catholic Confederation of Kilkenny in 1642.

In penal times as defenders of the priests, in the celebration of the holy sacrifice of the Mass in secret hiding places in the mountains and in the bogs of Ireland, the members of the order preserved the faith of their fathers for their posterity.

The priest and the schoolmaster alike were proscribed and a price was set upon their heads, and the Hibernians of that day provided shelter and protection and transport from village to village so that the national ideal and the national religion would not perish. For almost 200 years these bands of men were necessary for the protection of priest and people against religious persecution.

The lodge system which had existed in a loose form for generations was perfected in the latter years of the eighteenth century, and the method of collecting funds for the burial of the dead was in use.

In May 1836 a charter was sent from Ireland to New York City authorizing the organization of the order in America. One of the members, who was employed on a sailing vessel engaged in trade between America and British ports, was delegated to bring the charter to America. The charter they received was from the chief officers in those counties which had been hallowed by generations of conflict for faith and fatherland. This beginning of the order in America cannot be better described than by using the words of the late Bishop Shahan, rector of the Catholic University, who so eloquently said, "The first page of the order in America is beautiful for its simplicity and straightforwardness, touching for its candid Catholicism. It is as good a patent of nobility as was ever conferred by king or kaiser, for there is wanting in it no element of our liberal modern humanity. I can almost see these honest and sturdy representatives of the Irish race in Ireland, England, and Scotland handing over to ship-worn and tearful exiles of Erin the sacred sparks of liberty and faith, of chivalry and tolerance, of kindly humanity and large brotherly charity that, thank God, have ever since been cherished by the members of this organization."

The charter sent from Ireland reads as follows: "From the Brethren in Ireland and Great Britain to the Brethren in New York, Brothers, Greeting:

"Be it known to you and to all it may concern, that we send to our few brothers in New York full instructions with our authority to establish branches of our society in America. The qualifications for membership must be as follows:

"First. All members must be Roman Catholics, and Irish or Irish descent, and of good moral character, and none of your members shall join in any secret societies contrary to the laws of the Catholic Church, and at all times and at all places your motto shall be 'Friendship, unity, and true Christian charity.'

"You must love without dissimulation, hating evil, cleaving to good. Love one another with brotherly love, without preventing one another; let the love of brotherhood abide in you, and forget not hospitality to your emigrant brother that may land on your shores, and we advise you, above all things, have natural charity among yourselves.

"Also be it known unto you that our wish and prayer is that when you form your society, in many cities and towns, you will do all that is in your power to aid and protect your Irish sisters from all harm and temptation. As the Irish woman is known for her chastity all over the world—some of them may differ from you in religion—but, brothers, bear in mind that our good Lord died for us all. Therefore be it known unto you that our wish is that you do all that you can for the Irish emigrant girls, no matter who they may be, and God will reward you in your new country, and in doing this you will keep up the high standing and honor of the Irish in America.

"We send these instructions to you, hoping that you will carry them out to the best of your ability. Be it known unto you that you are at liberty to make such laws as will guide your workings

and for the welfare of our old society, but such laws must be at all times according to the teachings of the holy Catholic Church, and the obligation that we send you and all your workings must be submitted to any Catholic priest when called for.

"We send you these instructions, as we promised to do, with a young man who works on the ship and who called on you before. Send a copy to our late friend whom you spoke of and who is now working in Pennsylvania. Hoping that the bearer and this copy will land safe, and that you will treat him right, we remain your brothers in the true bonds of friendship, this 4th day of May, A. D. 1836.

"Patrick McGuire, County Fermanagh; Patrick McKenna, County Monaghan; Patrick Reilly, County Meath; John Farrell, County Meath; James McManus, County Antrim; Patrick Dunn, County Tyrone; Daniel Gallagher, Glasgow; John Reilly, County Cavan; Patrick Boyle, County Sligo; John Derkin, County Mayo; Thomas O'Rourke, County Leitrim; John McMahon, County Longford; Patrick Hamill, Westmeath; John Murphy, Liverpool."

Division no. 1, of New York County, met in the basement of old St. James' Church, at New Bowery and James Street. Every parish had at least one division, and their chief beneficence was in aiding the newly arrived immigrants to find work, in comforting the bereaved, and in extending every kind of helpfulness to the sick and destitute. The emigration contributed greatly to the membership of the order, for in 1838 the Irish Catholic population of New York City was about 70,000, while in 1840 it was 90,000.

From New York City the order spread to Philadelphia, Newark, the coal-mining regions of Pennsylvania, and westward with the tide of Irish emigration.

In New York the order was encouraged by the great John Hughes, first archbishop of New York, who saw in the sturdy catholicism of its members a source of strength to the church and a wall of defense against its enemies.

The early years were stormy. These were the days of anti-Catholic, and particularly anti-Irish bigotry. There were small riots throughout the city, windows of Catholic churches were broken, and ignorant and intolerant anti-Catholic mobs had attacked Catholics in the streets of the city.

In 1844, when the Know-Nothing fanatics held a meeting in city hall park, after the election of their candidate for mayor of the city, to welcome the church-burning Know-Nothing Party from Philadelphia, the members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians were summoned to the defense of the churches of the city by Archbishop Hughes, and, armed, they garrisoned the churches of the city, ready to defend them with their lives.

Again, in 1855, it was necessary for a brief time for the members of the order to guard the churches of the city, and at that time the members of division 1, of Brooklyn, who were guarding St. Paul's Church, at Court and Congress Streets, were threatened by a Know-Nothing mob, but the defeat of the Know-Nothings in a fight at the Catherine Street Ferry ended forever the threat of mob rule and the destruction of church property in New York.

It might be well to mention that the first St. Patrick's Day parade in the city was held under the auspices of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in 1838, and in 1853 there were 12,000 men in line and Mayor Westervelt and the common council reviewed the parade from the steps of the city hall.

A military company was organized chiefly from among the members of the Hibernians which later became the Ninth Regiment of the State militia. A second regiment, the Sixty-ninth, was organized soon after, and its first colonel was Charles S. Roe and its lieutenant colonel Michael Doheny.

In 1861, with the outbreak of the Civil War, whole divisions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians joined the Army in defense of the Union.

The Hibernians of New York, after the Battle of Chancellorsville, equipped a hospital tent and ambulance and offered it to General Meagher, and they were delivered to the Irish Brigade at Warrenton, Va., by Dr. E. D. Connery, the coroner of New York County, who was one of the most prominent Hibernians in the city.

At the close of the war the members of the order lay on every battlefield, and the Civil War, with its sacrifice of Catholic Irish blood, showed the Know-Nothing fanatics that the members of the order, which had defended the churches from the attacks of mobs, were just as willing to defend the flag of their country.

In the 1890's when the American Protective Association, commonly known as the "A. P. A." raised its head, the Ancient Order of Hibernians again led in stamping out this revival of the bigotry of the Know-Nothing.

It should be remembered that through the observance of St. Patrick's Day by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, through the veneration offered the patron saint of Ireland through the ritual and other customs of the order over a long period of years, that this national Irish feast has become a day of universal celebration in all parts of the United States. These celebrations have made popular the Irish customs and the Irish themselves among the varied races which have flocked to America.

Since my father was a member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and since I had the honor of taking part in this wonderful celebration, with pride I call the attention of the House of Representatives to the Century of Progress Celebration of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

LETTER FROM A FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I received from a former Member of Congress, a Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Hon. Montague Lessler, a former Member of Congress from the State of New York:

NEW YORK, February 13, 1936.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELANEY: The death of Charlie Curtis brought to mind that on the 2d of January 1902 (34 years ago) I was elected to the House from the then Seventh New York District. The election was the result of a special election held to fill the vacancy upon the resignation of Nicholas Muller, who had been a Member of Congress from the downtown and Staten Island district for a number of years. It was an interesting, lively campaign, conducted without the aid of the usual party management, and was, if I may use the term, a "solo" affair.

The district ran on the west side of the city from about Fourth Street, embraced the Battery, and curved around to go up the east side to somewhere in the neighborhood of Canal Street. It also included Staten Island.

Of course, in the Wall Street section there were not many voters. However, the election took place, and in a section that had never been represented before by a Republican, gave me 7,677 votes to 7,283 votes for my opponent. Some other time the story of that canvass may be of interest. At present I just want to tell you of some of the men I met in my brief term and some of the matters of interest viewed in the light of 34 years after the events.

The final canvass by the State board was not completed, but, nevertheless, on the motion of "Bill" Sulzer that was waived by the Democratic minority, and accompanied by him on the one side and Lucius Littauer on the other, I took the historic oath from Speaker Henderson in the Well of the House. I had been accompanied to Washington in a special car by a collection of politicians, saloonkeepers, ward helpers, ladies, and gentlemen as could be gathered; men and women who had helped me and who had been good to me, and so I felt that it was a kind of noble gesture to wind up the campaign by bringing them with me to Washington, where they were a noisy aggregation in the gallery and had a grand time at the old Arlington Hotel. I may add in passing that it is a sort of grateful recollection to me that my mother and father were both there to witness the swearing in. Of course, there was a great mass of flowers to mark the occasion. What to do with them was a problem, until it was finally suggested that they be sent to the hospitals, which was done. As a further mark of distinction, the House adjourned at once, and so I had a job, drawing a salary and nothing to do.

It is of interest to remember the men who were in the House and in the Senate when I came there. I do not think there is any man remaining today who was in either body in 1902.

I was promptly assigned to seat 399 in the back row. Each man then had a desk. I sat next to Beidler, of Cleveland, Ohio, and on the other side my nearest neighbor was Sutherland, of Utah, now Supreme Court Justice. There was a very interesting set of men at the House at this time. The New York delegation was headed by Senators Platt and Depew. Among the Republicans in the House were Tompkins, who has lately retired as justice of the supreme court; Littauer, who was later to make such a place for himself as chairman of Appropriations; Sherman, of Utica, who became the Vice President with Taft; George Ray, of Norwich, N. Y., who became United States district judge; Payne, of Auburn, N. Y., head of the Ways and Means Committee; General Wadsworth, of Genesee, N. Y., a delightful gentleman of real influence in the House and father of the present Congressman; James Breck Perkins, of Rochester, N. Y., a scholar, litterateur, and historian whose books on the Louis XV period of French history are still read and remain standard; Colonel Alexander, Buffalo, N. Y., whose work on the political history of New York State is as fine as anything that has been written on the subject. He was also the author of a work on parliamentary law. On the Democratic side were a number of men it was a delight to know and remember—Fitzgerald, of Brooklyn, now judge and then, while in the minority, usually recognized as one of the best parliamentarians in the House; Goldfogle, of New York City, a delightful little man who died in harness as one of the tax commissioners of the city; Amos J. Cummings, of newspaper fame, recognized as outstanding among journalists and a real figure in the history of journalism in New York; William Sulzer—what can one say about him except that he became Governor of New York State and thereafter faded away; George McClellan, of New York City, later professor of Princeton, who was twice mayor of New York City; dear Jake Ruppert, a kindly, sweet, helpful man, who has continued his public career as head of the Yankee baseball team.

I wish I had time to tell you more about the New York men—Storm, Bristow, Hanbury, George Lindsay—but you must remember that New York had 37 men, and I want to speak of other men.

The general focal point of all the young men in the House at that time was Jim Sherman, called usually "Sunny Jim." There was a kindness to the man, a helpfulness that can be remembered better than described. He had been in the House so long and was so acquainted with everything connected with it that it seemed the natural thing to turn to him and ask for his help in any predicament. He was head of the Indian Affairs Committee. The committee room was the meeting place of a number of men, and all their work was done there under the efficient supervision of the secretary of the Indian Affairs Committee, dear Harry Devendorf. Sherman, Knapp, Littauer, Emerson, Stewart, New York Congressmen, made their headquarters there, and by some sort of arrangement had their work done there also. It was in that room among those men that I first met Charlie Curtis, who was then the Member from the First District of Kansas and serving his fifth term in the House. I remember him very well. Of course, I got to know him and kept my acquaintance up after I left the House and went down to Washington to dinners and other celebrations. He was courteous, kind, helpful, and interested. Everybody, as I look back at it now, and especially on the Republican side, was keenly interested in my progress with the thought that possibly there might be a chance of a return from that district and a fooling of the constituents once more.

There were a number of other interesting men in the House on both sides of the Chamber. To me, the veteran Uncle Joe Cannon seemed a survival right out of the Lincoln antebellum days. There was a quaintness about him that certainly appealed. He had a power of expression in public, on the floor and in private, that made a lasting impression on those who came in contact with him. You must remember that at that time Mr. Cannon was 66 years of age, and had been in the House since the Forty-ninth Congress. He had been head of the Appropriations Committee for many years and had gradually become the leader of the majority. His main opponent was John Sharp Williams, later Senator from Mississippi, a man of extraordinary educational achievement, a fine scholar and a splendid linguist. It was indeed a treat to hear Uncle Joe and "Sharp" as Joe called him, in the center aisle fiercely encountering each other and then when it was all ended, to see them go out arm in arm. They not alone had a respect but an affection one for the other, and they were two outstanding men it was a joy to know. There were so many men in the House of real worth that it is difficult to try and remember all of them in the confines of this rambling letter and do credit to their many excellencies. It was a time of real debaters. Hepburn, of Iowa; Tawney, of Minnesota; De Armond, of Missouri; Champ Clark, of Missouri; Grosvenor, of Ohio; and Dailzell, of Pennsylvania, were men who took the greater burden of the political debate. In fact, it was currently believed that Clark and Grosvenor used to stage a debate preliminary to their excursion on the Chautauqua circuit. There were several others who were really powerful speakers. A new man, Littlefield, of Maine, always got the ear of the House by his earnestness and beauty of delivery and speech. It was said of him at the time that his name never disgraced a majority report and that he was always in the opposition.

We had a couple of humorists, too. There was a man, Cushman, of Washington, whose speeches brought together a full House, and who had the power of saying witty things without hurting. This was also the case with Bob Nevins, of Dayton, Ohio, a magnificent talker and really a sound lawyer.

There were two men in the House and it was a real rough-and-tumble to debate. One was De Armond, of Missouri, and Hepburn, of Iowa. They were afraid of nothing and had a blistering invective that took the hair and hide off the fellow who opposed them. There were some really charming gentlemen in the House. I recollect with real pleasure Adams, of Philadelphia, and Morrell, of Torresdale, Philadelphia, and, above all, Gillett, subsequently Speaker of the House and Senator from Massachusetts.

The man who was most attractive to me and whose knowledge of his work on the committee was monumental was Burton, of Ohio, who later became Senator. Congressman Burton was head of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. Everyone left the work to him. He gave to this work all his attention so that it was impossible to tell him anything about any mud creek in the United States, to say nothing of the great rivers and harbors, and, with it all, he was kindly and helpful with the thought in mind that he wanted to do the right thing to every man who had a creek for which he hoped to receive an appropriation.

Of course, the same kind of human beings were in the House then that are there now. We divided very sharply on politics. We had our man who did nothing but talk and who could not be shut up. We had the great objector and we had a man who knew everything and we had others who looked upon a seat in the House as a pleasant extension of their home success, possibly along business or banking lines. A great deal of hard work was done, and some play went on too. I think I should like to tell you about that sometime. But, all in all, it was without any doubt the finest aggregation of men that could be brought together. It represented every shade of variance in our great country. All races, conditions, and beliefs were there, and while intensively they were Democrats and Republicans, with very rare exceptions, I should say they were gentlemen. I have not been able to discover why a man cannot be a gentleman as well as a politician or statesman.

I wish I could tell you more of other men I got to know and how interesting Southern Democrats were. I think the man who charmed me most, outside of Williams, was Oscar Underwood. There was something so charming about this man; there was such

a bonhomie about him; he looked so much the gentleman that it was a pleasure to know him and a real treat to listen to him.

While I seemingly have omitted a great number of men, not with any idea that they were not fully worth remembering, because I hold every one of them very dear insofar as I got to know them. Some of these men made a great impression on me. Their weaknesses—and we knew that they were there and what they were—endeared them to us to an extent, and yet there was always a courtesy and a pleasant relation established. Rarely, if ever, did the men become vehement to each other. I only remember one such episode.

It was a great training to have had contacts of this kind as a very young man. While living in the past brings very little, yet I think to hold recollections of the men I met in the Fifty-seventh Congress is something to retain. I have no doubt that it was a training and experience that was the equal of any college course that a young man might have. Not the least of those memories were my contacts with Curtis, and as I really started out with that in mind more than anything else, I have always had the feeling that it was his generous pleasantness with a crowd of youngsters who commenced in the House and then in the Senate who brought to him allegiances which in the end made him Vice President of the United States. This was true of Sherman as well, and remains true of any man who pledges himself in the generous desire to lend his experience to others coming into this great arena and to be a delightful personable gentleman in every sense of the word.

With kindest personal regards and apologies for this long letter, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

MONTAGUE LESSLER.

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MOTHER'S DAY

MR. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

MR. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker: Amidst the strife and turmoil of national problems and international conflict, we pause to pay our respect and our solemn tribute to God's noblest creation.

The second Sunday in May is at hand, and we forget the differences that divide us in every field of human activity and join in a general, world-wide observance of Mother's Day.

MOTHER'S DAY WAS FOUNDED BY MISS ANNA JARVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mother's Day was founded by Miss Anna Jarvis, a native of my neighboring State of West Virginia and now a resident of my own State of Pennsylvania. She inaugurated this day of thanksgiving, remembrance, and of gratitude. It is one day that has not been commercialized and has continued to be a day wholly devoted to tributes of gratefulness and remembrance—a day of rededication to the spiritual forces that inspired our mothers to teach us to follow the right, to seek the truth, and to act humbly and justly.

It is beautiful to set aside one day to an ideal, one day apart for generous deeds, for good will—for who can think of mother without being kinder and more generous? It is a day in which we are absorbed with the thoughts of mother and unmindful of the shadows, rains, and storms of life; for when we remember mother, we remember the sunshine and happiness of youth; we forget ourselves and think kindly and lovingly of others. We recall our mother's abiding faith in our inherent goodness and her inspiration to us to go forward to better and nobler things. For the opportunity to observe such a glorious day and the fulfillment of such a noble and inspiring ideal, we are thankful to Miss Jarvis.

MOTHER'S DAY RECOGNIZED ALL OVER THE WORLD

Her devotion to an ideal has helped to bring more joy and sunshine to the lives of millions than any other idea born in the mind of any of our noblest citizens. From a modest beginning it is now universally observed; in every climate and in every language the message of Mother's Day is heard around the globe. It is given official recognition by England and her colonies. Mexico, Brazil, and numerous South American countries observe this solemn day. Even Asia and Africa lend their tributes to the mothers of the world.

Since May 1914 Mother's Day is officially recognized and proclaimed by the Government of the United States. For nearly a quarter of a century, through proclamation by the President of the United States, the American flag has been displayed on all Government buildings in tribute to the mothers of America. American consulates throughout the world are ordered to unfurl the Stars and Stripes in honor of American homes and mothers. Official orders of the State and Army and Navy Departments decree that the flag be displayed and proper observance be held of the solemn annual tribute to motherhood.

MOTHER'S DAY IS OBSERVED BY THE MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES

Commanding officers of the military and naval forces of the United States regard the observance of Mother's Day as a potent force for strengthening the morale of the enlisted personnel. They realize that when soldiers and sailors, many, many miles from their native land, think of home and mother, they cannot help but be overwhelmed by the noble sentiments, and then and there resolve to be a great and glorious force for home and country.

OLD GLORY IS PROUDLY DISPLAYED

It is a rare exception for Old Glory to be displayed on Sundays, but on the second Sunday in May this general rule is disregarded, and the national emblem displayed on the Nation's Capitol and on all other Federal buildings. For, on Mother's Day, Old Glory takes on a new significance as it waves heavenward in its solemn tribute to the American home—the foundation of American society and presided over in queenly fashion by the great American mothers.

Annually, Miss Jarvis cooperates with Cabinet members, the military and naval forces, and other governmental dignitaries in making the Mother's Day celebration esteemed as a day of tribute to our mothers and as a day of rededication to those motherly virtues of righteousness and truth.

THE CELEBRATION OF A DAY DEVOTED TO OUR MOTHERS MAKES US A BETTER NATION

No other country in the world anticipated this country in thus recognizing our homes and mothers as the national standard bearers of patriotism. America not only leads the world in resources and material wealth but in patriotism, sentiment, and those spiritual resources that make of this country the glorious world leader that it is, and has been for a generation.

It is indeed most fitting that this annual Mother's Day which originated in America should be acclaimed by the American Congress as a day of gratitude to the beloved living and as a day of remembrance for the honored dead. Miss Jarvis originated this day in her earnest and sincere desire to serve her home and her community. May God bless her and watch over her for many, many years to come.

WRITE HOME TO MOTHER

"Write home" is the injunction to all sons and daughters who have wandered far from home and whose daily lives are filled with material cares. This is an appeal that is answered by every son and daughter in every walk of life. On Mother's Day they forget all the cares and worries of the daily grind and write a letter home to mother, or send a telegram in which in a few words they convey those endearing sentiments of love and devotion. Some send a gift of flowers; others a gift for the home, or candy, or some other token of love and esteem. But, whatever the form or substance, the hearts of millions of mothers are made glad. They rejoice that their efforts have not been in vain. Every one remembers his mother in a special, particular, and even selfish sense. But here selfishness becomes a virtue, for the nobility of selfishness is in making others happy. Here they repay a debt of gratitude in remembering that their mothers took a selfish pride in making them better and happier.

"ALL IS WELL"

"All is well" is heard from far and wide as the children of mothers of the world send their message of cheer and hope. Mothers everywhere are thrilled and inspired by these messages of hope, for hope still springs eternal in the human

heart—in the hearts of mothers as well as children—hope in the future and its blessings. "All is well" is a divinely sweet melody that cheers the hearts and souls of motherhood; it is like a shaft of sunshine that gilds the rugged mountain peaks of life. Happy are those children who can send a cheery message to mother on Mother's Day and most divinely happy are they who can look at their mother's silver hair and say that not one single silver hair had been caused by a misdeed of theirs.

As the years roll by Mother's Day takes on greater importance and added significance to those still fortunate in having the guidance of their "gray-haired" mother. But to those whose mothers have gone to their eternal reward, the day is heightened and their devotion to the ideal of mother is increased.

WE REMEMBER THE MOTHERS OF THE WORLD, LIVING AND DEAD

As on Memorial Day, our hearts blossom in gratitude and we remember the brave men upon whom fate placed the laurel wreath of patriotism and sacrifice, so on Mother's Day we lovingly remember those dear departed mothers who, too, had made the supreme sacrifice so that the family and its noble institutions may be perpetuated and enriched. When we place a wreath on the grave of mother on this solemn day, the rich, fresh flowers and the green grass carry us off in fancy where we know that those mothers are serenely walking in green pastures by the calm blue waters. As we gaze heavenward through sapphire skies we feel certain that mother has seen, that she knows we did not forget. For there is nothing nobler than to remember the mothers of the world—living and dead.

Honor thy father and mother stands written among the laws of the most revered righteous. It is the very essence of life and the keystone of human relations. It is the commandment that is dutifully accepted by every creed. Mother's Day thus makes of the sacred commandment a living, throbbing reality.

THE RESOLVE TO GO THE RIGHT WAY

"For all her sorrows and her tears; for all her pains and fears, there's an overpayment of delight, when mother hears—that sons do right." Mother's Day would not have the universal appeal were it merely observed as a day of tribute and gift giving to mothers. Its real importance and value lie in making mothers happy by our doing right—in realizing that mothers would not want us to do otherwise. Its real achievement lies in dedicating ourselves on Mother's Day to so conduct our daily lives throughout the year that we should not cause mother an anxious moment, an unjust fear, or a needless tear. On Mother's Day we resolve to do everything mother's way, which is always the right way, through honor, justice, and humility.

OUR MOTHERS WANT PEACE ON EARTH

In this world of strife and turmoil, Mother's Day is also a day of dedication to the ways of peace. While mothers are not on the fields of battle nor in the trenches, they suffer more than their sons in the shell holes. War's greatest indictment lies in the suffering, agony, and fears endured by the mothers of the world. She had gone down to the valley of the shadow of death to bring forth the son who is perhaps being ruthlessly slaughtered. She had endured untold agonies in bringing the child safely through the helpless years of childhood into manhood. She had bestowed upon him all of her energies, love, and devotion. It breaks her heart to see him torn from her side and sent forth to be maimed or killed. No gift on Mother's Day, no tribute or manifestation of love and devotion to the mothers of the world, can have a fraction of the significance to mothers as the gift of universal peace—the resolution that every mother's son dedicate his very all to the advancement of peace.

THIS CONGRESS HAS MADE THE LIFE OF OUR MOTHERS EASIER

This Congress has done more than any other legislative body in the world to bring peace, comfort, and contentment to the American home and mother by its passage of the Social Security Act. Mother's Day is real and vibrant to us. We have recognized our obligation to the mothers of America

in making available adequate appropriations for maternity care. Mother is the holiest thing alive, and motherhood is the holiest of all divine gifts. We have made motherhood for the poor less agonizing and have made it easier for these noble women to raise their children.

THIS CONGRESS HAS BROUGHT SECURITY AND PEACE TO OUR AGED MOTHERS

"Over the hill to the poorhouse" was the usual epilogue to the drama of motherhood. But this, too, has been changed since we have recognized that our tribute to mothers must also take a more material form, and that our mothers are deserving of a better fate than the county home or some charitable institution. The Social Security Act which this Congress enacted has taken a great step forward in abolishing the despicable poorhouse. Its appropriations for pensions for the aged will make it possible for all mothers in America to spend the evening of their lives in their own homes which they cherish—among the children they love.

Mr. Speaker, this is the tribute to mothers that I wish to leave with you on Mother's Day. It is a recognition of our solemn obligation to our mothers, not only on this day but every day of the year. Not only gifts, flowers, telegrams, and letters on the second Sunday in May, but peace, comfort, contentment, and security for mothers every day.

LET US BE WORTHY OF OUR MOTHERS

It is impossible to measure the boundless love of a mother for her child; it is impossible to repay, in a material way, a son's or daughter's debt to a mother. It is needless to give water to the sea or light to the sun; we can never repay for mother love, for it gilds the cradle and illumines the grave. All we can do is hope constantly and pray fervently that we may be worthy of such boundless love and devotion; that all of mother's energies and cares shall not have been spent on us in vain; that we shall have followed her footsteps and leave this world far better and happier than we found it.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the permanent RECORD in accordance with the specific language inserted in my speech delivered on the floor of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I heard the speech the gentleman mentions and, of course, I have no objection to the gentleman's changing his remarks in the manner indicated, but the thought occurs to me that such correction as can be made has already been made. The gentleman in the speech he made today retracted certain remarks he made in another speech. I do not understand that a Member can correct the RECORD by taking out things actually said. The gentleman made the speech that is in the RECORD on the other occasion, and I do not understand that you can correct the RECORD by going back and changing a speech previously made.

Mr. Speaker, the point I make is that the speech which appears in the permanent RECORD was actually made by the gentleman. There is no denial of that fact. Now, he says he made the statement under a misapprehension. It seems to me, under the circumstances, the RECORD is complete.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has the right to correct the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think so.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, he cannot correct what is already in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is what the gentleman is asking to do.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am asking to strike out one word and three letters in the speech made on January 14, which appears on page 399 of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the request of the gentleman comes too late for that purpose. The speech referred to is already a part of the permanent RECORD.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE ONE HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ELGIN, ILL.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8234) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic pioneer memorial.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of the heroic Pioneer Memorial, there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint (not more than) 10,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size and weight, and of a special appropriate design containing a replica of the "Pioneers" to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided,* That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

Sec. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued at par and only upon request of the chairman of the coinage committee, Elgin Centennial Monumental Committee.

Sec. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by said committee, and all proceeds shall be used in furtherance of the erecting of the Pioneer Memorial.

Sec. 4. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coin; or for any purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

Sec. 5. The coins authorized herein shall be issued at such times as they shall be requested by the chairman of the coinage committee, Elgin Centennial Monumental Committee, and upon payment to the United States of the face value of such coins.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech recently made by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a luncheon of the United States Chamber of Commerce on April 30, 1936:

At the outset it must be borne in mind that communism is not merely a school of political or economic science. In its fuller aspect it is a philosophy of man. It is materialistic in its concept and impracticable in its operation. The purpose of communism is the establishment of a dictatorship of the so-called proletariat—through the medium of class appeal and class groupings. It seeks control of government and then, through the medium of a dictator, to put into operation the principles and policies of communism.

It is unnecessary to discuss in detail the manner in which they are attempting to accomplish their objective. They openly admit the use of any and all means, legal or illegal, or a combination of both, to bring about the objective that they seek. Their efforts in this country are not confined to mere expression or academic discussion. Practical efforts are being made in every conceivable way to create dissatisfaction and discontent and to capitalize on it wherever it exists in order to produce emotional results that will aid them in furthering their cause. They employ the "boring in" policy in labor, educational, religious, fraternal, and other organizations in order to obtain a position of advantage therein so as to influence the policies of such organizations. They employ the "united front" policy, where they join with other organizations in the agitation or furtherance of some program. They are not interested in any such program except as a means of using such organizations in the furtherance of their cause. They join with others, not because they believe in what others fight for, but to use the strength of their organizations for their own advantage. To them, anything in which they engage is simply a means to the end that they seek—the overthrow of government, not through the Constitution, but by force and violence.

At the present time they have a school in New York City with over 2,000 students in attendance each night, receiving instructions in the philosophy of Marx and Engels, and particularly being trained for the practice of sabotage and the exploitation of emotional situations. They are also taught methods which will prolong strikes that might properly be started in an effort to obtain higher wages or better working conditions or shorter hours of labor. In such cases they step in, not to assist in a fair settlement, but to prolong them as long as possible and then abandon the cause, leaving behind them misery and suffering. They are not interested in settlement; they are interested only in prolongation of a strike, exploiting existing conditions as a part of the means to an end. Their training is to enable them to induce others with whom they have nothing in common, to unctiously play their game. They are enemies of all existing governments, except sovietism. They do not owe allegiance to any flag but the red flag of revolution. They are unscrupulous in their demands and in their consideration of the rights of others. They have been making a determined effort for years to bore in on the American Federation of Labor. In one or two cases they have been successful in obtaining control of a union. I have in mind a union in New York City. The leadership of the American Federation of Labor, under President Green, are militantly fighting such efforts. President Green realizes the danger. In the past, little outside attention has been given to the great fight that he and his colleagues have been waging against communism. His great work should receive the attention and praise to which it is entitled. Businessmen should cooperate with President Green. It is to the advantage of business, when dickering with unions, to deal with men of the type of Green—men who stand for his kind of leadership in meeting this problem.

I have referred to a Communist union, originally a part of the A. F. of L., located in New York City. The special committee of which I was chairman investigated this union and found that it forced certain businessmen of New York City to pay tribute to them in order to continue in business. The union imposed a so-called unemployment tax of 3 percent of the total pay rolls of over 200 businessmen in the furrier business, also exacting a similar amount from the employees after forcing them to join the union. This money was used for communistic purposes. This evidence was the sworn testimony of businessmen who had paid the toll. We also received evidence that employees were forced to join this union, and when they resisted force was employed. American businessmen were then forced to pay tribute to this un-American union, and such money was and is being used in an effort to destroy the American Government, including the very business of these men. Some who had resisted testified that their goods were destroyed, their employees attacked and assaulted, finally compelling them to capitulate to the terms imposed. The evidence also shows that no employee had ever received a penny from this fund. The head of the Communist squad of the New York Police Department testified that this union maintained out of the funds received a gangster squad to intimidate employer and employees. Whenever any one of them was arrested, the same attorney always represented them. The lieutenant testified about many attacks on employer and employees, and also that there are at least two murders unsolved of employees who refused to join this union, being killed by the gangster squad of this Communist union. The police know who did it, but they cannot obtain the legal evidence.

Persons of this type should be shown no consideration. They know only the policy of force and violence. Their idea is to instill fear in the minds of others. Whenever such efforts, which disregard the rights of others, are employed, action by the police and courts should be rapid. About a year ago, in a city just outside of Boston, similar methods were employed. The police acted quickly, arresting those involved. The district attorney in charge acted quickly, prosecuting the cases and sending the offenders to jail. Raising of various funds for lawbreakers is simply a part of their program.

They are not interested directly in such persons or their cases, but simply in using a particular situation as a medium of exploitation. They are not interested in legislation except as a means to an end, to agitate and induce good Americans to become confused, or to exploit them, and to have them unconsciously play their game in politics. The Communist movement is not a political party. That is where the Columbia Broadcasting Co. made its mistake recently in allowing Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party of the United States, to use their facilities. If a Communist should be elected President of the United States, he could never take office. I have noted their recent statements about a Farmer-Labor Party, urging others to join with them in this movement. There are persons in this country who believe in such a party but who are opponents of communism. To them such a party is intended as a means of obtaining changes in the Government by the enactment of legislation in a constitutional manner. That is not the purpose of the Communists. Their purpose is to use such a political party as a part of their revolutionary program. This fact should be borne in mind by Americans interested in the formation of such a party. They should not permit themselves to be deceived by the Communists. The Communists' purpose, so far as such a party is concerned, is to obtain control of and use it as a means of furthering their objective. It is simply a part of their scheme. While under our law one can become a member of any political party that he desires to join, such action is voluntary. Nevertheless, the organizers and leaders of a Farmer-Labor Party, if one is organized nationally, either now or later, should not permit Communists to obtain control or even obtain a position of influence therein.

The Americans are a patient people. We have been for years the fertile field of foreign propagandists. However, when we awaken, we act, and usually, effectively. I remember several years ago when a European country was spreading propaganda in this country. We tolerated it for some time, and then became disgusted. An aroused public opinion asserted itself, in consequence of which the State Department acted. If it had not, a congressional committee would have been appointed to make an investigation. That kind of propaganda stopped.

Only a few years ago the committee of which I was chairman was appointed to investigate the Nazi, communism, and other un-American activities in this country. We obtained and gave to the American people such evidence that an aroused public opinion demanded that the efforts emanating from abroad cease. They have ceased.

For years we have listened to the prattle of these avowed haters of our country and their ideals, blasting the peace and quiet of our land with their advocacy of communism, by force and violence, as a panacea for all economic and social ills. We are getting tired of it. It is about time that we passed legislation that will make the members of this antisocial movement respect the rights of American citizens. It is about time that we passed legislation making it a crime to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence. Such a bill is pending in the House of Representatives, having been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. It is now before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee should report a rule in order that this bill might be considered by the House. I have tried to obtain such a rule, but have not been successful to date. That bill will pass overwhelmingly if brought out on the floor.

The people of the United States should demand that the Rules Committee bring this bill before the House. I urge all who are listening to demand the members of the Rules Committee to bring out this bill. Legislation should also be passed this session providing for the deportation of alien Communists. Over 50 percent of the members of the Communist Party are aliens. They advocate the destruction of our Government, and at the same time claim its protection. They earn their living under the protection of the Government that they hate and seek to destroy. They are not entitled to any sympathy or consideration. Drastic legislation along such lines should be passed at once. While this malignant theory of communism can never find any substantial support among the liberty-loving people of our Nation, nevertheless we must work to eliminate the evil results which proceed from their doctrine of force and violence. I do not recognize the advocacy of force and violence as constituting freedom of speech. It is license. One might just as well argue that the offering of human sacrifice as a part of a religious belief constitutes freedom of religious conscience.

I recently read a book written by Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, who is the leader of the movement in this country, wherein he admitted that such conditions as would constitute a revolutionary situation do not exist in this country. Despite that fact, he urges his followers to direct their efforts toward effecting such a situation. That shows completely their insincerity, their duplicity, their hypocrisy; that demonstrates that their philosophy cannot stand up under the light of reason. That is why they appeal to the unfortunate who is distressed; to those who are discontented; to those who are emotionally moved. They are trying to use those who can be swayed through emotion to obtain their objective. It is a sinister plot. They dare not resort to the constitutional method for bringing about changes. They have the opportunity under the Constitution to try to obtain their end, if they desire. They can advocate communism within the law by appealing to the people to vote for candidates pledged to the changes they advocate. If they are successful in influencing the people and electing enough legislators, they can change the Constitution. That is the constitutional way. But they dare not employ the method created by the framers of the Constitution. To do so they must appeal to reason. Lacking logical principles for an appeal to reason, they resort to the use of force and violence.

To again show their hypocrisy and the insincerity of their position, the same author, in an attempt to defend the use of force and violence, very blissfully states that the Communist Party advocates such drastic action only when the existing Government refuses peaceably to transfer to them control of its functions. He emphasizes the fact that force and violence are unavoidable in the United States because the people of this Nation do not desire communism. Therefore, they must be forced to accept it. They admit that the Government cannot be made into a soviet nation under the present constitutional processes which require the sanction of the people. Hence the great majority of our people who are peace-loving citizens must endure the wild and irrational acts of a small anti-American, antisocial group.

Earl Browder, in his recent book, *What is Communism?*, presents one of the best arguments against communism that I have ever read. In his attempt to further communism he exposes its hypocrisy—its weakness—he presents its true picture.

Of course, everyone knows that communism is opposed to every ideal that we stand for. It is opposed to the family life as it exists among religious people. It is opposed to religion in any form. It openly advocates the destruction of religion. It is opposed to religious freedom; to the freedom of speech and of the press; to the right of trial by jury. It stands for the confiscation of property. It is opposed to personal liberty in every form.

Yet Browder, in his book, *What Is Communism*, urges Communists to associate with religious groups and to organize them under the guise of the "united front." He states in no uncertain language that prospective Communists need not sever their religious affiliations before joining the movement, but after they join they will be subjected to a very rigorous educational process, in which the author expects the novice to see, as all Communists should, that religion must be destroyed. He talks about liquidation if the objective should be obtained. By liquidation he means what happened in Russia—the murder or imprisonment of all who oppose. In his book he also boasts of certain ministers who are co-operating with Communists under the "united front" policy. He ridicules and scorns them. I wonder how those he mentions feel after reading his book in the realization that he boasts of their use and then condemns them for believing in God and a hereafter. If such men have any judgment at all they will at once withdraw from any "united front" alliances that they now have with the Communists. Their efforts are to obtain the changes they advocate and which they believe are for the best interests of the people and to continue as ministers their work of God as their religion dictates. That is not so with the Communists. To them their "united front" efforts with others are simply a means to an end, using others in any way that they can, but intending to suppress them as well as all others if communism should be successful. How can they work with such men as Browder? Although I do not hold the same religious beliefs as these minorities, yet my respect for the freedom of religious worship urges me to warn them of the pitfalls to which their association with the Communists will inevitably lead. They are jeopardizing their own freedom of religious worship along with the freedom enjoyed by all others by permitting these scoffers and enemies of all religions to masquerade under their banner. What I have said also applies to a small group of professors.

In his book, Browder admits that Communists owe no allegiance to the United States. He states that Communists will not serve in any conflict in which our country might be engaged. He attempts to justify such action by declaring that communism is opposed to all wars. However, he boasts of the allegiance of Communists to the Soviet Union, urging all to join with Russia in defense of the Soviet Union. In other words, Communists will not fight for the United States but will fight for Soviet Russia. His hypocrisy is exposed. This is a valuable lesson to real Americans who believe in peace and who are doing all that they can to bring about permanent peace, but who will fight in the defense of our country. I warn you not to become allied with Communists under another phrase of the united-front policy. I particularly refer to the League Against War and Fascism, a communistic organization, and to certain college-student organizations.

The Constitution of the United States provides for any kind of a change the people desire. But communism is not content to proceed in the way provided for by the Constitution.

Under communism, personal liberty, which can exist only in a democracy, would be destroyed. It is suppressed under all forms of dictatorship. It is not necessary to mention history to support this statement. I call your attention to the countries of the present day wherein dictatorships exist. Personal liberty has been destroyed; persecution, fear, and force exist. The state is supreme. The individual has no rights. This is what communism stands for. It goes even further than most forms of dictatorship in its destructiveness of human rights. It does not even tolerate the existence of religion in any form. In fact, it makes war on religion and religious freedom—one of the great cornerstones of personal liberty.

Let the Communists renounce their advocacy of force and violence in trying to obtain their objective, a dictatorship of the proletariat, with its destruction of every ideal that America stands for. Let the people decide the issue in the manner provided by the Constitution; and while I will disagree with their objective and oppose their efforts, as is my right, I will fight to preserve their constitutional rights. In this way they will be acting within the Constitution and the law. I do not recognize the right of any movement to willfully and deliberately advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence.

We have plenty of problems confronting us. Fortunately, we have the means of peaceably determining our problems. They will not be solved by dictatorship of any kind, particularly of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. This movement, guided and directed from abroad, international in its character, claiming the protection of our institutions and at the same time hating them, and trying to destroy them, should be exposed for the alien, un-American movement that it is.

Communists are using a new line of defense by branding those who attack their activities or who make speeches along American lines as Fascists.

The passage of legislation making it a crime to willfully and knowingly advocate the overthrow of government by force and violence, and the strengthening of the deportation laws relating to alien Communists will, from a legislative angle, meet their efforts. No American fears such legislation. Such legislation does not affect the right of anyone to advocate any change that they believe in, provided they do so within the law. Society is justified—in fact, it is its duty—to protect itself and its law-abiding people against those who disregard the Constitution and the existing law.

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CAPT. PERCY WRIGHT FOOTE (H. DOC. NO. 489)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 7092, a bill for the relief of Capt. Percy Wright Foote, United States Navy.

Briefly stated, this bill provides that in recognition of his having been wounded in line of duty and of his exceptionally meritorious service in combat with the enemy during the World War, the line-selection board of the Navy in its consideration of officers eligible for consideration for selection for promotion to the grade of rear admiral may base its recommendation in the case of Capt. Percy Wright Foote upon his comparative fitness for the shore duties of the grade of rear admiral; that he shall remain on the active list of the Navy in his present rank until the report of the next senior selection board of the Navy shall have been approved; that if selected for promotion he shall be retained in his present rank on the active list until promoted to the rank of rear admiral; and that in the event of his selection and subsequent promotion he shall be carried as an additional number in grade.

The records of the Navy Department show that Captain Foote was appointed a naval cadet on May 20, 1897; commissioned ensign from June 6, 1903; promoted to the grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant from June 7, 1907; promoted to the grade of lieutenant commander from March 10, 1914; promoted to the temporary grade of commander from August 31, 1917; commissioned regular a commander from July 1, 1919; and promoted to the grade of captain from January 1, 1924, in which grade he is now serving.

In 1916 the system of promotion by selection was initiated in the Navy, with the object of insuring that only those officers deemed best fitted would reach command rank. Captain Foote has failed of selection before three selection boards, namely, those convened in 1933, 1934, and 1935, and under existing law he will be retired, because of service ineligibility for promotion, on June 30, 1936. Because of the provisions of the act of March 4, 1925, as amended by the act of March 3, 1931, the terms of which permit retirement in the next higher grade of those officers specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat with the enemy during the World War, Captain Foote would, if retired on June 30, 1936, do so in the grade of rear admiral.

On September 27, 1934, a special board of medical examiners pronounced Captain Foote physically qualified to perform all his duties at sea; and on his annual physical examinations on January 15, 1935, and December 19, 1935, he was found physically qualified to perform all his duties at sea or on shore. Because of the terms of the bill specifying that he shall be considered by the line-selection board of the Navy on a basis of comparative fitness for shore duty, approval of this bill would result in his being singled out for special consideration, as the other officers under consideration by the board would be competing on a basis of ability to perform all the duties of the higher grade.

At the present time the Navy is operating under a promotion system considered necessary to its efficiency. Medical records indicate Captain Foote's physical qualifications to perform all the duties of his grade, and he has been afforded ample opportunity for selection. In the absence of special circumstances sufficient to warrant his being placed in a class by himself the Navy Department feels that this legislation tends to break down the laws relating to promotion by selection. In the judgment of three selection boards Captain Foote was not one of those best fitted for promotion to the grade of rear admiral, and the Navy Department has never had reason to question these recommendations.

Justification for the enactment of this bill is based on the recital in the bill that it is "in recognition of his having been wounded in line of duty and of his 'exceptionally meritorious service' in combat with the enemy during the World War." It follows that the bill is calculated to bestow upon Captain Foote a benefit in addition to that to which he is entitled by virtue of the law providing for his retirement in the next higher grade.

The Navy Department is of the opinion that his service was not of such outstanding character as to warrant the unusual preferment this bill would extend to him alone, and to the exclusion of other officers whose records of service are equally meritorious; and that existing law is adequate to fully reward Captain Foote for his service during the World War.

For the above-stated reasons and because of the effect this legislation would have on existing law governing promotion by selection, I do not feel justified in approving this bill. I have come to this conclusion with great personal reluctance because of my knowledge of Captain Foote's war service.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 6, 1936.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RODMAN CHEMICAL CO. (H. DOC. NO. 490)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, House Joint Resolution No. 223, entitled "Joint resolution conferring upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction of the claim of the Rodman Chemical Co. against the United States."

This resolution is designed to accomplish a fourfold purpose, to wit:

(a) It would confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain a suit against the United States by the Rodman Chemical Co., of Verona, Pa., assignee of Hugh Rodman, for recovery of compensation for the use (prior to the issuance of a patent) of an invention by Hugh Rodman, covering a process for making activated carbon, notwithstanding the Commissioner of Patents had issued no order to keep such invention secret under the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 394; U. S. C. 35-42), entitled "An act to prevent the publication of inventions by the grant of patents that might be detrimental to the public safety or convey useful information to the enemy, to stimulate invention, and provide adequate protection to owners of patents, and for other purposes."

(b) It would entitle the Rodman Chemical Co. to claim reasonable compensation for the alleged use of the Rodman process, made by the United States prior to issuance of the patent thereon, to the same extent as if the Commissioner of Patents had issued an order to keep the invention secret, prior to such use; and further, such compensation would begin from the date of such use by the United States.

(c) The transcript of record of the interference proceedings between John C. Woodruff, appellant, and Hugh Rodman—No. 46630, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, April term 1925, Patent Appeal Docket No. 1815—would be made competent and admissible evidence before the Court of Claims on the issue of use by the United States of the Rodman inventions.

(d) The statute of limitations would be waived, provided the suit in question is brought within 1 year after the date of the passage of this resolution.

Proceedings in such suit are to be similar to claims filed in the Court of Claims under section 145 of the Judicial Code,

as amended. The Government may plead any defenses set forth in title 60, Revised Statutes.

The relief that would be afforded by this resolution extends to the Rodman Chemical Co. and not to the inventor of the subject matter of the patent as an individual. The Rodman Chemical Co. has heretofore filed suit in the Court of Claims based on the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917, or, in the alternative, under the act of June 25, 1910, as amended by the act of July 1, 1918. The latter statute gives patent owners the right to sue the United States for infringement of their monopoly. The act of October 6, 1917, relates to the publication of inventions during the war and the granting of compensation under certain conditions for wartime use of inventions tendered to the United States. The court held that the case did not fall within either of the acts relied upon by the claimant, and dismissed the petition on February 20, 1928. The plaintiff's petition for a writ of certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court on May 14, 1928 (277 U. S. 592; U. S. C. Cls. 772).

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that awarding relief in this case would constitute a discrimination which would be unfair to other potential claimants in a similar situation. It would, in effect, tend to nullify essential provisions of the act of October 6, 1917. It would encourage a multiplicity of similar bills and result in the revival of many old war claims in that class of cases, heretofore dismissed by the Court of Claims because of failure to comply with certain express provisions of the act of October 6, 1917. For the above reasons, I do not feel that I would be justified in giving my approval to this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 7, 1936.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

"THE PLOW THAT BROKE THE PLAINS", RESETTLEMENT FILM, LAUDED HIGHLY, SHOWS NEED FOR CONSERVATION

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LAGS IN MOVIES—RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION MOVIE SETS NEW STANDARD

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the pleasure of seeing a number of documentary films arranged in a program by the Museum of Modern Art Film Library. On this program was a film *The Plow That Broke the Plains*, which tells the story of the destruction of natural resources in the grasslands.

The headlines of the Washington Post say this morning, front page, double column, right on top, "Tugwell farmers' lot is sad compared to Soviet film ideal." It is true that a Russian film was shown, but so were films from France, Great Britain, and Germany. The tone and statement of the Post article omitted the fact that other countries were represented. Moreover, the article virtually snubbed the Film Library as well as the Embassies of France, England, and Germany.

GERMAN, ENGLISH, RUSSIAN, AND FRENCH FILMS

The Russian film showed immense cooperatives and hard-working people, smiling faces. The German film showed its work camps for men; solemn faces. Whether Stalin had ordered a smile or Hitler had demanded solemn looks, I do not know. It may all have been propaganda.

England was shown as being once a country of hills and beautiful farmlands; then its process of industrialization and uglification was depicted, with its present policy of slum clearance and cheap public power. The French film showed the beauty of the country, and the progress of its railroads;

handsome waiters passed out cool drinks to up-and-coming tourists. Trains slid through the French countryside at 200 kilometers an hour. The American film showed the tremendous waste of natural resources in the United States of America, principally of the Great Plains, which is the Middle West of the United States, starting in Montana and going through the Panhandle of Texas.

The American film showed a most important phase of American life: It showed that in this plains country 40,000,000 acres are now completely destroyed, with topsoil gone; another 200,000,000 acres are badly damaged and likely to be lost, unless something is done at once—and this out of only a total of 400,000,000 acres in the whole area.

The Film Library in arranging this program of documentary films from five nations is doing a real service. I think that as many of the foreign films should be shown as possible. For instance, certainly Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish films should be shown. Especially of Sweden, if Marquis Childs' book is correct—and I am sure it is correct in most of its factual aspects. Sweden has made tremendous advances in planned villages, in its cooperatives, in slum clearance, and in bettering life in general. Hence, a Swedish film would have been instructive.

MEN AGAINST DUST

While criticisms may be made of the Resettlement film because it shows the horrible waste of our natural resources, I think that films of that character must by all means be shown to awaken our citizens to the necessity for immediate steps in conservation. Moreover, the whole field of documentary films, which show the real problems of American life, offers a tremendous opportunity of development on the part of private companies.

Personally, however, I think a picturization of our forests, lands, waters—everything we have which is natural—also showing the hideous waste that we Americans have practiced should by all means be done. I do not object to the private film corporations, and it is entertaining to see Groucho Marx do his stuff; it is sometimes stimulating to see a love affair; while Walt Disney's Silly Symphonies and Mickey Mouse are outright grand. But thus far there has been no private film devoted to a serious treatment of saying we must be thrifty in the preservation of our own natural resources. Why do not the private film companies show unemployment, poorly planned cities, lack of sanitation—something about the plight of the sharecroppers and farm tenants who have no purchasing power?

It takes all kinds of people to make a world—and it takes all kinds of films to show what is really going on. We can sit around and gaze at love films and gasp and groan; we can shed a few tears and bust loose with lots of laughter—but we should also use our brains.

UNITED STATES LAGS IN EDUCATIONAL MOVIES

Mr. Speaker, this country is the furthest advanced of all nations on earth in movie technique, production, and equipment. But that is not true of the Government. In the production of films some progress has been made, but not much in comparison to other nations. In England the General Post Office has completed over 400 documentary films. In France the finest musicians and technical workmen are employed by the Government to dramatize its work. Even in smaller nations, such as Mexico, the motion picture is recognized as an important medium for Government information. We are the most backward government of any civilized, first-class nation in our utilization of the motion picture.

As a government, we are far behind and we might as well face the fact that it is a perfectly proper thing and quite desirable to have the best type of movies to be used for educational and informational purposes by the Government. I favor the full development of the movies by the United States Government for the purposes mentioned.

I wish to make it clear that I do not believe in Government competition with private industry, but the Federal Government should produce its own educational films.

FAMOUS DIRECTORS PRAISE

The Resettlement picture has aroused highly favorable comment not only from public officials but from high figures in the motion-picture industry. I should like at this point to read telegrams from two of the leading directors in Hollywood. One is from King Vidor, who produced *Our Daily Bread*, awarded an international prize for producing the finest picture of 1934; he also directed *The Big Parade*, *The Crowd*, *The Champ*, and is now doing *The Texas Ranger*. Mr. Vidor says:

Please accept my congratulations for the splendid picture you have made *The Plow That Broke the Plains*. Not only does it drive its point forcefully and graphically but it utilizes the motion-picture medium in its purest form; something that pictures made solely for entertainment purposes barely have an opportunity to do. I feel that in spite of its moderate length, no one who sees this picture can help but be impressed by the broad scope it embraces.

Lewis Milestone, who has praised the Resettlement picture, is also one of the top directors in Hollywood. He directed *The Front Page*, *All Quiet on the Western Front*, and is now doing *The General Died at Dawn*, which was written by Clifford Odets. Mr. Milestone says:

I saw *The Plow That Broke the Plains*, Resettlement Administration production written and directed by Pare Lorentz. I have also seen a great many documentary films of all nations and regard Mr. Lorentz's by far the best. It has more emotion and drama without the use of human characters than most plays can provide with living beings, because it is based on the truth. In my opinion the Government would gain its aims for the people with much more surety by releasing this and other such intelligent documentary films for general public education.

CRITICS PRAISE FILM

The newspaper critics and commentators who have no ax to grind have been unequivocal in their praise.

Bob McCormick, of the Scripps-Howard Washington News, says, among other things, in lauding the film:

The photography is indescribable. It is a series of magnificent scenes, flowing together in continuity sufficient to carry the story. It may have been equaled in other pictures shown in Washington, but it is doubtful if it has been excelled. . . . Movie experts in the Federal service here say the production, a three-reeler, is perhaps the finest ever turned out by a government. This includes the artistic efforts of the Russians and the Germans.

Betty Hynes, dramatic critic for the Washington Herald, says, in commenting on the entire program of documentary films:

Most dramatic of all was the contribution of Mr. Lorentz, who took America's tragic dust storms and graphically told their history. . . . An amazing, stirring picture. . . .

Under the headline "The New Deal's First Major Movie Effort Packs a Terrific Punch", Mr. Fredrick C. Othman, United Press staff correspondent, says:

Before the final fade-out it had diplomats, Congressmen, and New Dealers holding to the edges of their gilt chairs. It may have been preaching a sermon, but it surpassed many a Hollywood epic for sheer drama and technical excellence.

OFFICIALS LAUD PICTURE

A number of public officials have praised *The Plow That Broke the Plains* in no uncertain terms. Time will not permit quoting all of them, but I should like to give just a line or two from each one:

Secretary Wallace has said:

. . . It is a moving record of what happened where farmers by their Government plowed lands which should never have been taken out of grass. . . . The combination (musical score and photography) is a thrilling example of what is almost a new art. The picture is an astonishingly graphic portrayal of land use history of the Great Plains. . . .

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, says:

The Plow That Broke the Plains is one of the finest pictures I have ever seen. Simply, yet dramatically, it tells the story of the havoc wrought by the improvident use of our soil resources. I wish every one in this country could see it, because to do so is to

be impressed with the urgent need for national action to restore the balance nature demands in the use of her resources.

Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, says:

This film in my opinion is an agricultural Cavalcade.

Senator ALVA ADAMS, of Colorado, says:

The film is a vivid dramatic presentation of the unplanned co-operation of land-hungry men, war, drought, and wind in the destruction of the grasslands of the West. It is a remarkable film production.

THE PROGRAM

At this point I should like to include a copy of the program of the documentary films shown at the Mayflower last night.

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART FILM LIBRARY PRESENTS A PROGRAM OF DOCUMENTARY FILMS

May 10, 1936, Grand Ballroom, Mayflower Hotel

Color Box, 1935-36. Designed and executed by Len Lye. Produced by the General Post Office Film Unit (Great Britain).

Harvest Festival, 1935. Directed by M. Kapchinsky. Photographed by Alexander Lavrick. Produced by Ukrainfilm, Kiev, U. S. S. R.

The Face of Britain, 1934-35. Directed by Paul Rotha. Photographed by George Pocknall, Frank Bundy. Produced by Gaumont-British Instructional.

The Triumph of the Will (excerpt only), 1934. Directed by Leni Riefenstahl. Produced by the German Government.

Midi, 1935. Supervised by Marcel l'Herbier. Directed by Jean Gréville. Produced by the French State Railways.

The Plow That Broke the Plains, 1936. Written and directed by Pare Lorentz. Photographed by Ralph Steiner, Paul Strand, and Leo Hurwitz. Musical score by Virgil Thomson. Produced by the Resettlement Administration.

THE PLOW THAT BROKE THE PLAINS

An American musical documentary movie produced by the Resettlement Administration

PRODUCTION CREDITS

Written and directed by Pare Lorentz.

Supervised by John Franklin Carter.

Photographed by Ralph Steiner, Paul Strand, and Leo Hurwitz. Narrated by Thomas Chalmers.

Special score composed and arranged by Virgil Thomson.

Conducted by Alexander Smallens.

Technical supervision, Leo Zochling.

Musicians from the Metropolitan Opera Association and the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.

FOREWORD

The Plow That Broke the Plains is a saga of the land of the Great Plains area of the United States. Dramatized in 10 principal sequences, the film traces the story of the plains country during the last 50 years. This panorama of American history surveys the successive movements in the Great Plains area—the passing of the buffalo, the successive invasions of range cattle, the homesteader, and the large-scale wheat farmer. Dramatized, too, are the disastrous dust storms which whip across once fertile acres, carrying away rich topsoil and bringing tragedy to the Great Plains. The production also shows in pictorial and graphic detail the work which the Resettlement Administration is doing in the Great Plains area.

THE SCENARIO BY SEQUENCES

Sequence 1. Grass: "First there was grass * * * a treeless wind-swept continent of grass * * * a country of high winds and sun * * * without rivers, without streams, and with little rain."

Sequence 2. Cattle: "Then came the cattle. Up from the Rio Grande * * * in from the rolling prairies. * * * Down clear from the eastern highways the cattle rolled into the old buffalo range. * * *

"An empty, inexhaustible pasture—an unfenced, uncharted range, a thousand miles long. * * * With the southern plains for winter grazing and the mountain sweeps for summer grazing it was a cattleman's paradise. * * *

"Fortunes in beef! Railroads brought the markets to the edge of the plains * * * land syndicates poured cattle into the grasslands from the world over. * * * Cattle syndicates and land speculators followed the steers into the grasslands * * * by 1886 not an acre was unclaimed. * * *

"More cattle * * * the railroad brought the market closer and it brought the sheepman and dirt farmer * * *

Sequence 3. The Homesteader: " * * * the plowman followed the herder * * * and the pioneer found the plains. * * *

"Land in the West! * * * land in the last frontier * * * new land for new populations. * * *

" * * * 160 acres of Government land * * * free homesteads for farmers—by steamship, rail, and wagon trains they poured in * * *

"The first fence—and the last of the free range."
And came the reaper as the plowman harvested. "Free land in the West * * * 320 acres of Government land * * * 100,000 new farmers in a year—a half million settlers in a decade. * * *

* * * Progress came to the plains." And with rains the harvests were bountiful.

Sequence 4. Warning: "Many were disappointed * * * as the rains failed and the sun baked the light soil * * *

"They fought the loneliness and the hard years—but the rain failed them and they moved on."

"There was fresh land in the West * * * there was more grass farther on—new homesteads—new land for the taking * * * and there was a new day coming * * * a golden day for the plains—a day of new causes—new profits and new hopes."

Sequence 5. War: "Wheat will win the war! Plant wheat! Plant the cattle ranges * * * plant your vacant lots * * * plant wheat! Wheat for the boys over there! Wheat for the Allies! Wheat for the British! Wheat for the French! Wheat for the Belgians! Wheat will win the war!"

Sequence 6. Speculation: "Then we reaped the golden harvest * * * then we really plowed the plains. We had turned under millions of new acres for war wheat. We had the manpower. We invented new machinery. The world was our market! And the rains held on. By 1923 the old grasslands had become the new wheatlands * * *

But speculation led to a crash, while * * *

Sequence 7. Drought: " * * * once again the rains held off and the sun baked the earth. But this time no grass held moisture against the winds and the sun * * *. This time millions of acres of plowed lands lay open to the sun."

"1930—the worst drought in the history of the plains!"

"1931—the rains held off—and the machinery rusted * * *

"1932—no seed to plant—no land to put it in * * *

"1933—and still the rains held off * * * and then the high winds and the sun took toll from the plowed acres turned to the sun * * * and then the high winds came."

Sequence 8. Dust storms: "High winds whipped across once fertile acres, bringing death and disaster * * * bringing havoc to farms, tragedy to human beings."

Sequence 9. Devastation: "Baked out—blown out—and broke! For 6 years the cattleman, the sheepman, and the dirt farmer fought the worst drought in the history of the country * * * their cattle starved on the barren land—or died in sandstorms. Their homes turned to a nightmare of swirling dust day and night—their farms were buried under tidal drifts and their lands turned to desert wastes."

"Many left, but many stayed until stock, machinery, homes, credit, food, and, finally, even hope were gone."

"For 6 years they fought sun and wind and watched their homes blow away until finally they left the plains by thousands. * * *

"Once again they headed west—in 1935 over 30,000 refugees hit the road out of the drought country every summer month and headed for the last border—the Pacific. * * *

"Nothing to stay for—nothing to eat—nothing to hope for. Homeless—penniless and bewildered—looking for a stopping place * * * they joined the great army of the highway."

"No place to go—and no place to stop—no more frontiers—no more land—their homes on four wheels * * * their work in the fields—in the towns—along the highways."

"No more frontiers—except the great new frontier of reconstruction. Frontier of rehabilitation for damaged lands and for damaged lives."

" * * * 400,000,000 acres—the Great Plains seemed inexhaustible, but in 50 years we turned the grass lands into the dust bowl * * *

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RAMSEY, for Monday and Tuesday, on account of important business.

To Mr. HARLAN, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HENNINGS, indefinitely, on account of personal illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4524. An act to provide a permanent government for the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 158. An act authorizing the President to present a medal in the name of Congress to Johannes F. Jensen;

S. 427. An act authorizing the reimbursement of Edward B. Wheeler and the State Investment Co. for the loss of certain lands in the Mora grant, New Mexico;

S. 1494. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims", approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 555);

S. 2040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof;

S. 2517. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Walter M. Graesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired;

S. 2611. An act to authorize the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association to construct and maintain a monument on the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Salt Lake City, Utah;

S. 2849. An act to provide funds for cooperation with Wellpinit School District No. 49, Stevens County, Wash., for the construction of a public-school building to be available for Indian children of the Spokane Reservation;

S. 3241. An act authorizing adjustment of the claims of F. L. Forbes, John L. Abbott, and the Ralph Sollitt & Sons Construction Co.;

S. 3372. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school district at Hays, Mont., for construction and improvement of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children;

S. 3460. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the persons entitled to compensation on account of private claim 111, parcel 1, Nambe Pueblo grant;

S. 3516. An act for the relief of Alice D. Hollis;

S. 3544. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of the Texas Pacific-Missouri Pacific Terminal Railroad of New Orleans;

S. 3581. An act for the relief of Henry Thornton Meriwether;

S. 3687. An act to validate payments and to relieve the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army on account of payments made to Reserve officers on active duty for rental allowances;

S. 3688. An act to validate payments and to relieve disbursing officers' accounts of payments made to Reserve officers promoted while on active duty;

S. 3737. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire, by donation, land at or near Newburgh, in Orange County, N. Y., for aviation field, military, or other public purposes;

S. 3747. An act for the relief of Malzee Hamley.

S. 3748. An act to authorize the Bureau of Mines to conduct certain studies, investigations, and experiments with respect to sub-bituminous and lignite coal, and for other purposes;

S. 3769. An act for the relief of Marcellus E. Wright and Lee, Smith & Vandervoort, Inc.;

S. 3797. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1920;

S. 3859. An act to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain War Department property, and for other purposes;

S. 3932. An act for the relief of Ann Rakestraw;

S. 3950. An act to aid in defraying the expenses of the Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1937;

S. 3977. An act to authorize the Washington Gas Light Co. to alter its corporate structure, and for other purposes;

S. 4135. An act for the relief of Helen Curtis;

S. 4214. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Sabine and Neches Rivers, with a view to controlling their floods and regulating, conserving, and utilizing the waters thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 4416. An act for the relief of Josephine Russell; and

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Swedes in Delaware.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the

President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 567. Joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for expenses of special and select committees of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1936.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, tomorrow, May 8, 1936, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1391. A bill to authorize and direct the United States Commissioner of Fisheries to undertake fish-cultural and related activities in Puerto Rico, making appropriations therefor, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11375. A bill to repeal a proviso relating to teaching or advocating communism in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and appearing in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 2593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TERRY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 212. Joint resolution to investigate corporations engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery; without amendment (Rept. No. 2596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 681. A bill for the relief of James Philip Coyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 2594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. House Joint Resolution 504. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance to Sekigo Takahashi of a permit to reenter the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936 and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 12625) to amend paragraph IV, Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (a), promulgated by the President pursuant to Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 12626) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Ada, State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12627) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Crestline, Crawford County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 12628) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects, to authorize payments to States and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFARLANE: A bill (H. R. 12629) to provide the Congress with information on the state of the development of the aerial war craft of the United States in comparison with that of other nations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 12630) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects, to authorize payments to States and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 12631) to amend section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270); to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 12632) granting an increase of pension to Florence A. Clarkson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12633) for the relief of George J. Zeigler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 12634) for the relief of M. Leslie Martin; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 12635) granting a pension to Milka N. Robbins, and minor child; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12636) for the relief of Harry Francis Zeller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 12637) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Westbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 12638) for the relief of Patricia Swan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 12639) for the relief of Marcello Milani; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 12640) for the relief of Harold King Boyce; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12641) granting a pension to Joseph Dion; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12642) granting a pension to Bertha C. Keith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12643) granting a pension to Ida B. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 12644) to refund income and profit taxes erroneously collected on storage batteries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 12645) for the relief of David Leo Lieb; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10846. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the United Upholsters' Union of New York, Local No. 44, U. C. L. M. I. U. of N. A., endorsing and requesting the enactment of legislation for the creation of a court of appeals for civil-service employees with a set-up of national and local machinery and

with employee's representation thereon through his recognized union representative as outlined in the Pearson bill (H. R. 9258); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10847. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Housing, urging the enactment of Senate bill 4424 and House bill 12164; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10848. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the Associated General Contractors of Minnesota, urging Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to provide Federal-aid funds sufficient to conduct Federal-aid highway work during the fiscal year 1937 without interruption; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10849. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 8293, pertaining to the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10850. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition signed by residents in Rockland County, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 5051, which proposes the repeal of section 213 of the Economy Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10851. By Mr. NICHOLS: Petition of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; to the Committee on Flood Control.

10852. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to maintain the Civilian Conservation Corps at its present quota of 500,000 men for another year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10853. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the conference of mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., concerning the George bill (S. 2883); to the Committee on Education.

10854. By Mr. TERRY: Petition of the northwest district of the Catholic Union of Arkansas, in the interest of the program of the Arkansas Valleys Association for the construction of flood-control reservoirs on the Arkansas and White Rivers, tributaries of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1936

(Legislative day of Friday, Apr. 24, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 7, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of the parents of Albert Thesing, Jr.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8234) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic Pioneer Memorial, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore: